150

Harry Kaplan

LIBRARY OF
TMJ
TODD M. JOHNSON

LIBRARY OF
TMJ
TODD M. JOHNSON

RELIGION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

SHERWOOD EDDY

RELIGION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

BY

SHERWOOD EDDY

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

COPYRIGHT, 1927,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

RELIGION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE
—C—
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	ECONOMIC PROBLEMS	25
	America's Amazing Wealth	25
	Wealth and Poverty	31
	The Land of Luxury and Waste	36
	The Effects of Poverty	43
	Helpless Dependence and Depletion	44
	Bad Housing and Unwholesome Family Life	48
	Sickness and Death	51
	Mothers and Children in Industry	53
	Vice and Crime	54
	The Effects of Luxury	58
	The Teaching of Jesus	63
	Attempted Solutions	82
	An Illustration of Stewardship	84
	An Illustration of Voluntary Poverty	87
	An Illustration of Democracy in Industry	90
	A Universal Obligation	93
	Social Justice in Industry	99
	The Purpose of Industry	102
	The Motive of Industry	107
	The Method of Industry	111
	The Spirit of Industry	114
	The Conduct of Industry	119

CHAPTER PAGE

II. RACIAL PROBLEMS 128

III. INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS 136

IV. REDEEMING THE SOCIAL ORDER 145

Liquor and Law Observance 145
Sex Problems 152
The Present Situation 152
Sex Education 162
Marriage and Divorce 164
Prostitution and Disease 168
The Revolt of Youth 169
Obsolete Legislation 174

V. THE PROBLEM OF RELIGION 193

A Personal Experience 197
A Universal Experience 198
A Satisfying Experience 199
A Rational Experience 203
A Social Experience 203

RELIGION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

RELIGION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

For several years the writer has felt a growing dissatisfaction with "things as they are" and an increasing desire to find a way that leads to "things as they ought to be." Society to-day seems to be semi-pagan, while organized religion lacks the spiritual dynamic to transform it. Our social order is characterized by gross inequality of privilege; vast wealth unshared, side by side with poverty unrelieved; flagrant luxury and waste confronted by unemployment, poverty and want; costly homes and resorts for the rich, and reeking slums and disgraceful housing conditions for the poor.

Our present order results in a world of strife. There is strife between conflicting classes in industry; between competing races, white and black, yellow and brown; between contending nations, each one of which is a law unto itself in an international anarchy leading periodically to

overt war. The forty wars of the past century have been the almost inevitable result of the economic and political maladjustments of our social order. Facing this social order whose injustice cries to heaven, are we to accept it supinely in nerveless irresponsibility and cowardly subjection, or are we to challenge it, to grapple with its problems and to do all that is within our power to solve them?

With such thoughts in mind the writer felt he must face these social issues in his own life. As confessions cannot be written in the third person he asks leave to use the first.

In 1894 my father died, leaving to me a small inheritance and to my mother the greater part of a small estate. At that time I had practically no conception of the claims of social justice. As a student volunteer, however, I was concerned with the project of foreign missions. Several of the mission boards were in debt, and there was a congestion of student volunteers who could not be sent to the field for lack of funds. With my fellow worker, Horace Pitkin, who was later martyred in China, I turned from the colleges

and the appeal for men who might go to the mission field, to the churches for money to send them. It was then that I began to see for the first time the power that money had over men; how utterly inadequate was their giving and their sense of the stewardship of life.

At the same time I became responsible for the carrying on of my father's business and the making of investments. They began to succeed. I was making money and I liked it. I believed that money was power, but it began to get power over me. About this time I made a study of the teaching of Jesus upon the subject of wealth and property and felt that I must be consistent if I was to profess to be his follower.

At that time I proposed to our family that we should take this teaching regarding wealth seriously and that we should agree not to increase our capital, but having paid our own expenses, we should devote the remainder of the income to various causes of human need. We decided to keep our capital fixed, make good any losses from time to time, and devote the proceeds to Christian work.

On this basis I went out to India as a missionary in 1896. Since that time, for more than thirty years, I have never taken any salary; I have endeavored to live upon my income, and give all in excess of my personal needs, wherever I thought it would do the most good. That position has satisfied me until recently, but it satisfies me no longer.

I found I was living in a comfortable home, enjoying many privileges for myself which others could not have. Naturally the old justifications came to my mind: why should I not enjoy these privileges? Was not the money mine? Could I not afford it? Nevertheless, I found other disturbing questions beginning to confront me. *Was* the money really mine? Was the teaching of Jesus searching, inescapable truth, or empty, vapid sentiment? How long could I continue to call him "Lord, Lord," and do not the things which he so clearly said? And just how much luxury and comfort could I afford, when little children in my own city were literally being stunted mentally and spiritually and dying physically for want of the bare essentials of life?

Was I to withhold and cling to these special privileges for myself and my family, or to share with those who needed them here and now?

After full consultation, study and mature deliberation, my wife and I decided to take the first steps leading toward the simple life. We owned a comfortable apartment in the suburbs of New York. It would rent for from $175 to $200 a month. We decided to begin first of all to save at this point. Nearer to the city we found the modest homes built by the City Housing Corporation. These rent for $75 a month. By the payment of one-tenth the cost of the house, we found that a net cost of $39.24 a month would procure a small but comfortable five-room flat.[1] We accordingly offered our former home for sale and moved into the new house.

Again, we found that the average income of

[1] The City Housing Corporation, Sunnyside Gardens, Long Island City, limits itself to a six per cent dividend upon its investment and endeavors to provide decent housing facilities for persons of moderate means. The cost of a typical two-family brick house is $13,750. Of this only one-tenth is paid in cash. There is a monthly carrying charge, including interest, maintenance, insurance, etc., of $114.24 for two families. If half the house is rented at the usual figure of $75.00, it leaves a net cost of $39.24 a month for 23 years for the purchaser. This is little more than the cost of the dark rooms in the slums of New York's iniquitous housing system.

the head of half the working-class families in this country is about $1,500 a year, or a little more than $4.00 a day.[1] They live upon a very small income because they have to do so. The question arose, then, should not we also, sharing as far as possible every privilege with others, endeavor to live upon the lowest possible income consistent with health and efficiency. We shall probably find it impossible to live as cheaply as the average working man, living as we are in the most expensive city in the world. Certainly we do not profess to have done it. But should we not show cause for every dollar that we spend upon ourselves? Just how far it will lead us we do not know. But we shall endeavor to apply the following principle to our expenditures: anything spent upon ourselves, invested in necessary food or clothing, for our health or efficiency,

---

[1] How difficult it is to maintain a family of five persons upon an income of $1,500 will be seen from the following budget:

Food	$563.92	This budget provides:
Shelter	162.37	Food, 11 cents per meal per person;
Clothing	287.82	Rent, $13.53 per month;
Fuel, heat and light	75.15	Clothing, $1.10 per week per person;
Sundries	315.54	Fuel, heat and lighting, $1.45 per week;
	$1,404.80	Sundries of all kinds, $1.22 per week per person.

See "Wages and the Family," by Paul H. Douglas.

which we believe will do more good in this personal way than if it were invested in the needy children of our city, or in worthy causes at this moment languishing for lack of support, we shall so spend. But if it would do more good if shared with and invested in others, we shall endeavor so to share it. In any case, we feel that we must begin to take seriously the matter of personal expenditure, to test the possibilities of the simple life.

So much for the matter of income; but what about the capital? This money was not personally earned but was inherited. It was derived from the "profit, interest and rent" of our present social system, with all of its inequality and injustice. Individually none of us created the system, nor alone can we change or wholly escape it. We cannot go and live upon a desert island for the sake of an academic principle. Even if we did so, and a community were founded there, it would not, if history constantly repeats itself, remain ideal and perfectly just. Must we not then do the best we can under the present system?

For myself, I have decided neither to keep the property for my own use, nor to give it away where I could have no control over its expenditure, but to regard it as a stewardship or trust, the income of which shall be devoted to carrying on the common work to which some of us are devoting our lives. The income will go toward the support of a group of workers, among them my family and myself, who are seeking to lead the simple life, who are devoting their lives to an endeavor to establish that coöperative brotherhood, or united human family, which Jesus called the Kingdom of God on earth. We stand not only for faith in God but for justice to man.

We speak personally and unofficially, not as representing the views of any organization or denomination, but in general we believe in remaining in and working loyally with all such existing organizations as long as it is permitted. If we left these organizations or denominations and came out from them, we should only have to organize afresh, and these new organizations would in turn tend to conventional conservatism under the control of privileged groups. As

Hegel shows, the idea gives birth to the organization; then the organization tends to throttle the idea. Instead of coming out from them, as long as it is possible, we feel that we must first try to reform and renovate all institutions upon the principles of social justice. Each and every institution was made for man; not man for it. Whether the Sabbath or the Law; the temple or synagogue; the church or the state; the home or the school; marriage or divorce; religion or morality; custom or law—each and all are *for man,* for the development of a more abundant life for all, upon the principles of social justice.

We are not blind to the fact, however, that Jesus' way of life was, and probably always will be, radical, in the sense that it goes down to the very root of things. It will inevitably involve serious consequences for any who would follow it, as it did for him.[1] In loyalty to his way of life this group of workers seek to share their lives with others, believing that the supreme task of mankind is the creation of a social order, the

[1] As in the King James and Revised Versions, pronouns referring to God or Christ are not printed in capitals.

Kingdom of God on earth, wherein the maximum opportunity shall be afforded for the development and enrichment of every human personality; in which the supreme motive shall be love; wherein men shall coöperate in service for the common good and brotherhood shall be a reality in all of the daily relationships of life.

We believe that in the spirit and principles of Jesus is to be found the way of overcoming these evils. We believe that social changes should be effected through educational and spiritual processes, especially by an open-minded examination of existing evils and suggested solutions, full discussion and varied experimentation. We believe that these changes should be sought by constructive evolution, not by destructive revolution. We utterly disagree with those who hold that the end justifies any means, however ruthless or even treacherous. We equally disagree, not only with destructive revolutionaries, but with heartless reactionaries who would defend the *status quo,* oppose all efforts for social justice, and in the name of patriotism and religion villify and

malign all who seek constructively to meet the demands of social justice.[1]

If we ask whether the forces of organized religion are prepared to Christianize this social order, we find that apparently they are themselves deeply in need of reform. How many professing Christians have enough vital religion fundamentally to affect their daily lives? What impact are they making upon society about them? How far are they Christianizing industrial, racial and international relations? Or, how far are they weakened and divided in denominational divisions and party strife?

Whichever way we turn we find ourselves deeply in need of *something*. To whom shall we go or to what shall we turn for relief? War, that promised to end war, has not only utterly failed us but has half-wrecked our world. Politics and the old diplomacy, like war, have failed us. Neither the democracies nor the dictatorships into which the world is to-day divided can

[1] A reasoned and moderate presentation of the practices of these reactionaries in America to-day will be found in "Professional Patriots," by Norman Hapgood, pp. 37-66. Publisher A. and C. Boni, New York.

yet boast of any final solution of our unsolved problems. Faced by what seems to them at least the temporary breakdown of democracy, some ten countries have turned to dictatorships. But at what cost? Often growing tyranny and fear, denial of civil liberties to all save one clique or party, open contempt for democracy and parliamentary government, manufactured propaganda and the suppression of truth in the press, the inevitable resort to violence, and frequently the moral deterioration of the great body of the people under the loss of their liberties—surely this is too heavy a price to pay for a brief and artificial outward maintenance of industrial and political order.

Organization, carried to the utmost limits in industry, has given us its mass production, the material basis of the good life for all, but manipulated by human selfishness, it has all too often produced wealth for the few, want and discontent for the many. Science, that has explored and analyzed all nature, from the electronic atom to the distant nebula, and has already harnessed the powers of nature beyond the dreams of myth

and magic, has left us cold at heart, has not taught us to master our sordid selfishness or adequately to use the bounties of a prodigal nature for the welfare of our fellow men.

Is there then any possible solution of our modern problems? Is there any system or principle that can change the individual and transform society? Every social system, whether capitalism, communism or socialism, tends to break down just at the two crucial points of the control of the individual and the development of social responsibility. Is there any dynamic in religion that can meet this supreme need? Has any religion actually appeared in history which, in its purity and at its best, has in the past transformed the individual and society?

Let us examine the religion with which we in the West are most familiar—Christianity. In its first appearance in its primitive simplicity and power, what latent forces of human nature did it release and how did it function? If it ever worked, can it be made to function to-day under the complex conditions of modern life so as actually to furnish the drive and power that we need

for the personal and social ends which we seek?

But what is Christianity? Is it following Jesus' way of life in the simple love of God and man? Is it true that Jesus gathered up, centered and simplified all life in the single universal essential of righteous love? And could we define love not as an idle sentiment or passing emotion, but as the full sharing of life? If so, could we say that to apply this all-inclusive principle of love, or, to seek "the good life" for all humanity would mean for each of us personally at least the following five things?

1. *To live simply* and sacrificially, avoiding waste and luxury. To make the purpose of life the making of men rather than the making of money. Not to grow rich in a poor world by laying up treasures for ourselves but to share all with our fellow men. To apply the golden rule in all our relationships.

2. *To practice brotherhood toward all.* To remember that every human being is a person of infinite worth, deserving the fullest opportunity for self-development. To participate in no secret order or fraternity if it tends to exclusive-

ness, prejudice or strife. To seek justice for every man without distinction of caste or color.

3. *To make peace* where there is strife; to seek to outlaw war, "the world's chief collective sin," as piracy and slavery have already been outlawed, substituting a positive program of international justice and good-will.

4. *To redeem the social order;* to test its evils by the principle of love, and fearlessly to challenge them as Jesus challenged the money-changers in the temple. To endeavor to replace them by the constructive building of the new social order, the Kingdom of God on earth. If a student, to apply this purpose immediately to the problems of the campus; to seek education for service rather than the mere enjoyment of privilege, the attainment of grades or the achievement of cheap "success"; to tolerate no dishonest practices in classroom, athletics or college elections; to maintain no relationships with our fellows, men or women, which debase the supreme value of personality.

And since we realize our inability to achieve this way of life unaided:

5. *To seek a new discovery of God* which will release new springs of power such as men in the past have experienced when they rediscovered the religion of Jesus.

Let us examine these five principles in turn.

I. ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

AMERICA'S AMAZING WEALTH.—The war that impoverished Europe left the United States the one, and only one, fabulously rich and prosperous creditor nation in the world to-day. Our wealth is enormous. We possess approximately one-third of the wealth of the entire world. According to the last report of the Federal Trade Commission and the statement of President Coolidge in his Kansas City address, our wealth is now approximately $400,000,000,000.[1] We

[1] Address at Kansas City, Nov. 11, 1926. "Report of Federal Trade Commission," 1926, p. 2.

The growth of our wealth has been phenomenal, as shown by the following table:

Date	Total Wealth	Per Capita Wealth
1850	$7,135,780,000	$308
1900	88,517,307,000	1,165
1912	187,239,000,000	1,965
1922	320,804,000,000	2,731
1927	400,000,000,000	3,428

Since 1850 our per capita wealth has increased tenfold and our total wealth fifty-five fold. "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1925, and 1914, p. 628. The figures for 1927 are added, calculated on the basis of an estimated population of 117,000,000.

possess more than a third of the world's railways and of its developed water power. With only about six per cent of the world's population, we are producing over half of the world's iron, steel, copper, zinc, timber, paper and other things in proportion. We have nearly half of the world's gold supply, in coin and bullion, leaving some sixty other countries to divide the remaining half as best they can.[1] We are producing 43 per cent of the world's coal, 71 per cent of the petroleum, 87 per cent of the automobiles. We possess in this favored country 81 per cent of all motor vehicles, leaving 19 per cent for all the rest of the world.[2]

The American people, according to the National Bureau of Economic Research, had already in 1926 an aggregate income for the year of nearly ninety billion dollars, an increase of 43 per cent since 1921, averaging over $2,000 for

---

[1] "Federal Reserve Bulletin," April, 1927, p. 276. Gold holdings of the forty principal countries at the end of 1926 were nearly $9,180,000,000. Of this amount about 44 per cent was held in the United States; 37 per cent in the 25 European countries, and 19 per cent in the 14 other principal countries of the world.

[2] "The Manufacturers' Record," Nov. 4, 1926, compares our resources with the entire continent of Europe.

every person gainfully employed.[1] Thus our annual income is greater than the entire wealth of most other countries, including the sixty millions of Germany, the hundred and forty-three millions of Russia, the three hundred and twenty millions of India and the four hundred millions of China. Yet, with the world in our debt, a score of less favored nations will have to pay into our already filled coffers vast sums for several generations to come.

Including the sum proposed in the unratified agreement with France, the total principal owed to us in the inter-allied war debts is eleven and a half billion dollars; and the total payments we are to receive over the next sixty years are roughly twenty-two billion dollars. Our maximum annual receipts from these debts will be four hundred and twenty-two millions, or more

---

[1] Equivalent to $52,900,000,000 in 1913 dollars, "News Letter of National City Bank," May, 1927. Senator Borah reminds us that according to the census we have 27,000,000 families in the United States. Forty-six per cent of these own homes; 15,923,000 are electrically lighted, 17,790,000 have telephones. The people own 19,237,171 automobiles; 26,016,000 pupils were registered in elementary and secondary schools; 2,755,000 in public and private high schools; 999,200 in universities, colleges, professional and normal schools. New York *Times*, May 15, 1927.

than a million dollars a day.[1] As pointed out by the faculty of Political Science in Columbia, seconded by the faculty of Princeton, the large future payments we are to receive will be less than one per cent of our income, yet these sums may be "a crushing load" to the toiling populations of improverished Europe, upon whom the burden of payment must ultimately fall.

Great Britain, suffering from creeping paralysis in her three chief industries, with unemployment chronic to the extent of a million men or more, must pay us a total of over eleven billion dollars in the next sixty-two years. She will have to pay us amounts that rise to nearly half a million dollars a day or a hundred and seventy

---

[1] For a full discussion of the significance of these debts see "Dollars and World Peace," by Kirby Page, price, 15 cents. Also "The Interallied Debts," May, 1927, pp. 195, 197, 268, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, No. 230. The forty-two members of the faculty of Columbia maintain that "the war debt settlements are unsound in principle . . . and are fostering a deep sense of grievance against us." They urge "complete reconsideration in the light of present knowledge" through an International Conference, called to review the entire problem. "The phrase itself, 'capacity to pay,' rings hard and heartless. Payments that could at best mean a paltry gain for most American taxpayers mean to the over-taxed debtors a crushing load. Can any thoughtful American view with indifference the growing odium with which his country is coming to be regarded by our European associates?"

millions a year. A man of the middle class in England must work eight months to support his family and four months of every year toward paying the national debt.

France, whose debts had increased twenty-seven fold in the century before the last war, now has a crushing load of debt consuming 37 per cent of her wealth. Germany's huge payments under the Dawes Plan, beginning in 1929, reach the stupendous total of 625 million dollars a year or over a million and a half dollars a day.[1] And these vast sums must be paid by Germany that has already lost by the war more than a tenth of her area and population, a quarter of her coal, three-quarters of her iron, nine-tenths of her merchant marine, all of her colonies, and approximately half of her total wealth. With an average wage of about a dollar and a half a day, often a dollar a day or less for unskilled labor, Germany's depleted and sweated laboring population must toil for sixty years to come to pay these sums to Britain, France, Italy and Bel-

[1] "Interallied Debts," p. 197. How can defeated and depleted Germany pay this vast sum if Great Britain is finding such difficulty in paying about one-quarter of this amount annually?

gium, which in turn will pour them into our coffers.

To our eleven and a half billions in foreign government loans, we may add the even larger and rapidly growing sum of over thirteen billions in American foreign investments. These foreign investments are increasing at the rate of a billion dollars a year. According to Mr. Thomas W. Lamont of J. P. Morgan and Co., speaking at the dinner of the American section of the International Chamber of Commerce in Washington, May 2, 1927, "The gross annual interest and sinking fund service payable to America upon foreign loans issued here, including government loans, and the dividends from the industrial and other investments now total about $1,000,000,000 per annum."[1] Before the war the United States was a debtor nation to the extent of nearly three billion dollars. To-day we are a creditor nation to the extent of some twenty-five billion dollars.

---

[1] New York *Times*, May 3, *The Chronicle*, May 7, 1927.

American investments in Europe.....	$2,500,000,000
American investments in Latin America.	4,210,000,000
American investments in Canada.....	2,825,000,000
American investments in Asia, Africa, etc.	870,000,000

This enormous annual payment of a billion dollars a year is steadily to increase. The larger payments have not yet begun. The position of America as the most fabulously rich nation ever known in history, with the world now in our debt, places us in a position of grave responsibility. How is this responsibility to be met?

Wealth and Poverty.—In the richest country in the world, the most prosperous known in all history, producing over half of many of the world's most essential goods, it would seem that there could surely be provided, in this one land at least, the simple material basis of the good life for all. Owing to the grossly unequal division of wealth and income, however, such is not the case. Although there is a prosperous middle class of skilled workers and small owners, there is on the one hand a group of enormous fortunes representing wealth, power and privilege unshared, and on the other hand poverty and bitter want unrelieved. Let us examine the facts.

At the top of the financial scale in the United States are 207 multi-millionaires with a declared

income of over a million dollars a year, according to the figures issued by the Treasury Department in 1927.[1] Somewhat less than five hundred families each possess fortunes rising from twenty millions up to nearly two billions.[2] According to Mr. Joseph S. McCoy of the Treasury Department, there are now approximately 11,000 millionaires in this country, or more than double the number in 1914.

"For the income year 1925, .29 of 1 per cent of the population (or less than a third of 1 per cent) pay over 95 per cent of the individual income tax; 17 per cent pay less than 5 per cent of the tax, and the remaining 82 per cent pay no income tax."[3] The New York *Evening World* points out that this means "unprecedented prosperity for these 207 Americans," each with an income of over a million dollars a year, but "a fraction of 1 per cent makes the greater part of

---

[1] "Literary Digest," April 16, 1927, p. 10. This does not include others who have huge investments in tax-exempt securities, jewels, works of art, etc.

[2] "Dynastic America," by H. H. Klein, formerly Deputy Commissioner of Accounts of New York City, p. 13.

[3] Mr. Ogden Mills, Under-Secretary of the Treasury, "Literary Digest," April 16, 1927.

the profits, and that does not indicate a healthy prosperity for the nation. Nor does the fact that 82 per cent do not make enough to pay any income tax, mean national prosperity."

According to the report of the Federal Trade Commission for 1926, 1 per cent of the estates in America left 59 per cent of the wealth, while 13 per cent owned more than 90 per cent of the wealth. At the other end of the scale individuals in the non-probated class of the poor left an average of only $450 at their death.[1]

As pointed out by the Commission on Industrial Relations, "the ownership of wealth in the United States has become concentrated to a degree which is difficult to grasp." The fortune of Henry Ford, who has repeatedly refused an offer of a billion dollars for his business, is now estimated at from a billion and a half to two billion dollars. With three hundred millions in ready

---

[1] "Report of the Federal Trade Commission," 1926, pp. 1-4. This agrees with the "Report of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations" in 1916: the rich 2 per cent of the people of America owned 60 per cent of the wealth; the middle class 33 per cent owned 35 per cent of the wealth; the poor 65 per cent owned 5 per cent of the wealth. Only 4,171,051 persons received sufficient income to pay any income tax in 1925.

cash, his income is estimated by the New York *World* as nearly two hundred dollars a minute, $11,415 an hour, $273,976 a day or about $80,000,000 a year.[1]

Ten corporations have now passed the billion dollar mark.[2] These ten corporations control some fifteen billion dollars in assets, or more than five per cent of the total private wealth of the country. The concentrated control of these corporations is steadily growing. The Federal Trade Commission in its recent reports shows that thirty companies each control a large portion of the bituminous deposits and the petroleum reserves,

6 companies control one-third of the American water power

8 companies control over three-quarters of anthracite deposits

---

[1] New York *World,* Feb. 4, 1927, and "The World To-morrow," October, 1927.

[2] U. S. Steel Corporation, Southern Pacific, Pennsylvania Railway, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., New York Central, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Union Pacific Railway, Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, General Motors and Ford Motor Company. New York *Times,* March 27, 1927.

4 companies control nearly half the copper deposits

2 companies control over one-half of iron ore deposits.[1]

A leading article in the conservative *Washington Post* says, "A single group of not more than 20,000 business men is in charge of American prosperity to-day. . . . This group of men are determining the policies of the nation's leading corporations and are over-shadowing all competitors. . . . The stockholders of those 1,200 corporations will receive in dividends half of the net profits of American business."[2] Professors Tugwell, Munro and Stryker of Columbia, at the close of their very conservative survey of "American Economic Life," say: "We have proceeded haphazard and have evolved a system of

[1] "Report of Federal Trade Commission," 1926, p. 4.

[2] *Washington Post,* Sept. 9, 1926. It may be justly pointed out that there has been in recent years a wide diffusion of ownership of stock among employees. But the recent report of the Federal Trade Commission shows that while employees comprise 7.5 per cent of the common and 3.5 per cent of the preferred stockholders, the value of their holdings is only one and a half per cent of the common and less than two per cent of the preferred stock. "Federal Trade Commission," 1926, p. 7. This can hardly be called a "revolution," as described by Professor Carver.

apportionment that is indefensible in its logic as it is disastrous in its consequences. . . . Our enormous annual national incomes are badly apportioned; so badly apportioned, in fact, that eighty-six per cent of our people still live in poverty,[1] while a very few command an immense aggregate control over income that permits them to indulge in such wastes and extravagances as were never known in the world before." Some of these wastes and extravagances we shall now examine.

THE LAND OF LUXURY AND WASTE.—As you view the crown jewels of the Czars of Russia in the light of the condition of the poor in that country you see the insolent effrontery of selfish luxury in the face of grinding poverty. Eighty per cent of the people of Russia had been left in illiteracy, and some sixty per cent in poverty, living often in hovels, as Tolstoi describes them, scarcely fit for beasts. In Moscow you look upon a forest of Czarist crown jewels valued at

[1] These writers arbitrarily define as poor any person receiving less than $2,000 a year.

$225,000,000. Here is a crown composed of five thousand of the choicest diamonds, worth $52,000,000, an eight million dollar emerald, a sapphire worth eleven millions, a miniature gold train of cars, a child's rattle and toys studded with gems, etc., etc.

But it gives us pause to realize that it was not Czarist Russia, but that it is America which is the world's outstanding example of a land of wealth, of waste and of luxury.

The United States Treasury Department has estimated that in a recent year the people of the United States purchased luxuries as follows:[1]

Tobacco	$1,847,000,000
Theaters, movies, etc.	934,000,000
Soft drinks and ice cream	820,000,000
Candy	689,000,000
Jewelry	453,000,000
Sporting goods, toys, etc.	431,000,000
Perfumes and cosmetics	261,000,000
Chewing gum	87,000,000
	$5,522,000,000

[1] "Journal of the National Education Association," May, 1927. "The automobile bill of the American people is more than $14,000,000,000 according to a report by the Bureau of Industrial Technology," or an average of $117 for each man, woman and child. This includes cost of cars, insurance, garaging, interest, taxes, etc. New York *Times*, March 22, 1926.

And if to the above list we added Federal Attorney Buckner's estimate of the national bootleg trade at $3,600,000,000 a year, a sum in excess of the annual budget of almost every other country in the world, we should have a total of over nine billions annually spent for luxuries in this country.

We are commercializing even our sports. College football has now become "big business," closing the season last year with 15,000,000 in attendance, gate receipts of $30,000,000, with many magnificent stadiums costing millions more. The Army-Navy game in Chicago attracted a throng of 110,000 with gate receipts of approximately $800,000, not to mention the enormous sums spent in carfares, automobiles, and festivities connected with the game and the celebration that followed. The Tunney-Dempsey prize fight cost over $3,000,000.

Recently in this country $7,000,000 was spent on a mansion with 121 rooms for one family. A larger amount was spent for a winter residence in Florida by an absentee citizen; $600,000 was spent for a diamond necklace; $20,000 for a hat;

$1,000 for a hatpin; $75,000 for opera glasses; $30,000 for an automobile.[1] Recently 330 Italian cars have been imported at a cost of $16,000 each. We puffed away ninety billion cigarettes last year and nearly two billion dollars in tobacco smoke. One earnest Christian man has just spent $500,000 for a play house for his six children.[2]

The most characteristic example of American luxury may be found in the record of expenditures on Park Avenue, New York, as estimated and officially stated by H. Gordon Duval, President of the Park Avenue Association.[3] The 4,000 families who live on this avenue between 34th Street and 96th Street spend a total of $280,000,000 or $70,000 per family during the year. They spend for women's clothing $50,000,000 a year, or $192,000 a day; for liquor, according to the reporter, $15,000,000. They spend $26,922 a day for yachts, $11,538 a day for flowers. A father spends $25,000 a year for

---

[1] "Christianity and Economic Problems," by Kirby Page, p. 47.
[2] New York *World*, Sept. 19, 1926.
[3] See New York *Times* and New York *World*, Jan. 28, 1927.

a single débutante daughter. The women and girls in this section on average each spend yearly $6,250 for clothing, $2,000 for furs, $500 each in beauty shops, $900 for hats. The paltry five millions that these four thousand families give to "charity" is only one-tenth of what the women spend on clothing alone. And a large proportion of these people are professing Christians.

The following is a partial list of their yearly expenditures:

	Average per year
Women's wear	$50,000,000
Rent	18,000,000
Furs	16,000,000
Traveling	15,000,000
Art Galleries	15,000,000
Restaurants	10,000,000
Automobiles	10,000,000
Millinery	7,000,000
Yachts	7,000,000
Amusements	5,000,000
Beauty Shops	4,000,000
Total for 4,000 families	$280,000,000

Stuart Chase thus sums up some of our appalling totals of waste in this country:

Of our 42,000,000 workers gainfully employed one-quarter are forced to devote themselves to

needless or harmful things, not in the production of true wealth, but to the "illth" of vice and crime, harmful drugs, quackery, adulterated food, speculation and gambling, super luxuries, militarism, etc. Six million employees, or 15 per cent of our man-power, are diverted to the production of luxuries. For every seventy cents spent on education, we spend one dollar on advertising, a total of $1,284,000,000, employing 600,000 workers. With six million workers idle on a given working day, with a total loss from lack of scientific management equivalent to the work of five million employees, and from lack of industrial coördination to four and a half millions more; with several millions diverted to the production of harmful things, Mr. Chase estimates a total waste of fifty per cent of our man-power.

In the waste of our natural resources we are witnessing "the rape of a continent." Only 15 per cent of our available water power is now used. Three-fourths of our oil has been wasted to date. Our original 800,000,000 acres of virgin forests are already reduced to 138,000,000 and are fast disappearing. Of our coal we are wast-

ing 750 million tons a year, of our water power 50 million horse-power, of oil one billion barrels, of natural gas 600 billion cubic feet, of lumber 5 billion cubic feet annually.[1]

Yearly there are upwards of 25,000 fatal accidents in industry, 700,000 accidents causing four weeks' disability or more, over 2,000,000 causing more than one day's disability. Probably three-fourths of these could be eliminated. There are in the United States almost 5,000,000 persons over 10 years of age who can neither read nor write. Of 28,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 18 only 16,000,000 are regularly at school, while 12,000,000 are not. Only one child in 54 gets a chance to go to college, and this opportunity is often trifled away by the sons of privilege. The rich five per cent of the families in this country appropriate thirty per cent of the national income. "This immediately operates to slam the door on any hope of the wage earners of the country averaging enough to go round in terms of the subsistence level budget. For mil-

[1] "The Tragedy of Waste," by Stuart Chase, pp. 60, 143, 264-270.

lions of people in America the annual income is, and has long been, in the words of Dr. W. F. Ogburn, not a living but a dying wage."[1]

Let us now examine at the two extremes of the social scale the effects of poverty on the one hand, and then the effects of luxury and waste on the other, in order better to realize our own responsibility for present conditions.

The Effects of Poverty.—Dr. Edward T. Devine in "Misery and Its Causes" shows that poverty and its resultant misery are chiefly traceable, not to the moral failure of the individual, but to economic causes of maladjustment which society can control and remove. Poverty concretely means overcrowded, unsanitary tenements, sickness, foul slums, lack of playgrounds, bad working conditions, inefficiency, sickness, degeneracy, youthful delinquency, the corruption of criminal courts and police systems, the corrupt alliance between politicians, policemen and vice, youthful offenders hardened into enemies of society, and the whole brood of the ills

[1] "The Tragedy of Waste," by Stuart Chase, pp. 60, 143, 264-270.

of sunken humanity that result from our inefficient and inhuman social system.

Among the causes of poverty may be mentioned low wages, overwork, sickness, industrial accidents and unemployment. A study of these causes of poverty is the study of the degradation of a large part of mankind.

We understand by poverty a standard of life below that which will provide for physical efficiency and social decency. We must at the outset recognize poverty as a social crime. We must realize *our* part in poverty. People are poor chiefly because society as a whole makes and keeps them so. Children are growing up in poverty because our neglect permits them to do so. As Professor Jacob Hollander points out in "The Abolition of Poverty," poverty persists "only because men do not desire sufficiently that it shall cease." Among the effects of poverty we may note the following:

Helpless Dependence and Depletion.— The first obvious effect of poverty is the helpless dependence to which it reduces the worker. If

he is without land, without a home, without possessions, without tools or means of livelihood over which he has any control, the worker may stand constantly on the brink of poverty. And, be it remembered that the workers who are left in helpless dependence are themselves responsible in large measure for the production of the wealth which they do not share.

Professor Hobhouse says, "Property is thus an integral element in an ordered life of purposeful activity. It is, at bottom for the same reason, an integral element in a free life. . . . On the one hand property is the material basis of a permanent, ordered, purposeful, and self-directed activity; on the other hand property is a form of social organization, whereby the labor of those who have it not is directed by and for the enjoyment of those that have. . . . It is not inequality as such that is the fundamental fact of our system. It is the entire dependence of the masses on land and capital which belong to others. . . . Thus while modern economic conditions have virtually abolished property *for use,* they have brought about the accumulation of vast

masses of property *for power* in the hands of a relatively narrow class."[1]

The power that property and wealth give to those who possess them over those who have nothing is enormous. Once under the system of slavery the master owned the worker; under serfdom he controlled him by owning the land upon which he subsisted as a dependent; under the present system the possessing class, by owning the factory, together with the natural resources, raw materials, credit, the land, and often the homes of the workers and their tools, has almost as effective control over the workers' means of livelihood as in the days of slavery or serfdom without any of the responsibility that went with the care of the slave or serf.

One of the worst results of our present system is the helpless dependence of the unskilled worker due to unemployment and insecurity of life. Indeed our system makes large-scale unemployment almost inevitable. Stuart Chase shows, as we have seen, that in America there is a mini-

[1] "Property," by Bishop Gore and others, pp. x, 9-21, 36, 64.

mum of nearly six million workers idle on any given working day by virtue of causes which a functional society would be at pains to eliminate.[1] In Germany eighteen million workers are insured against sickness, sixteen millions against disability, twenty-three millions against accident, and the bulk of the unemployed are now receiving unemployment insurance. In rich America we provide but little of such social insurance and the poor and unemployed are left to shift for themselves. A whole brood of other fears spring from the basic fear of unemployment. There is the fear of discharge and of unfair treatment because of his utter helplessness; the fear of tyrannical or capricious behavior of the employer or the boss; the fear of injustice; the fear of injury or sickness; the fear of dependence with no voice in determining his wages, hours or conditions of work; the fear of reduction in standards of living and a score of other apprehensions that haunt the helpless poor.

Ira Stewart says of poverty, "Poverty makes

---

[1] "Tragedy of Waste," p. 144.

the poor poorer, and independence impossible. It corrupts judges, ministers, legislators and statesmen. It decides marriages, shortens human life, hinders education and embarrasses progress in every direction. It gives rise, directly and indirectly, to more anxiety, suffering and crime than all other causes combined. Poverty crams cities, and then tenement houses with people whose conduct and votes endanger the republic. The dangerous classes are always poor. . . . Poverty falls most crushingly on woman. A woman who has no resources for a living . . . is tolerably sure to become in time either the poor man's slave or the rich man's plaything. . . . It is their poverty, destitution and consequent dependence, that compel the poor, every day of their lives, to make the best terms possible with those who hold in their possession the surplus wealth of the world."[1]

Bad Housing and Unwholesome Family Life.—E. E. Wood in "The Housing of the Unskilled Wage Earner" shows that "one-third

[1] "Encyclopaedia of Social Reform," p. 935.

of the people of the United States are living under subnormal housing conditions, conditions which fall below the minimum standard, and about one-tenth are living under conditions which are an acute menace to health, morals and family life. The same conditions meet us everywhere—lot overcrowding and room overcrowding, dark rooms and inadequately lighted rooms, lack of water, lack of sanitary conveniences, dilapidation, excessive fire risks, basement and cellar dwellings."[1]

The New York State Commission on Housing and Regional Planning reports that only three per cent of the new apartments constructed in 1924 are within the reach of seventy per cent of the population, and that families with annual incomes of less than $2,500—and that includes more than two-thirds of all families in the city—"are afforded no decent place in which to live, to rear children, and to enjoy a home life."

A select committee appointed by the New York Legislature made the following report:

[1] Edith Elmer Wood, "The Housing of the Unskilled Wage Earner," p. 7.

"Our experience, like that of the cities of the old world, is that the avarice of capitalists renders government interference for the protection of the poor and unfortunate an absolute necessity. . . . Strictly commercial private enterprise has not satisfactorily supplied the housing needs of the unskilled wage earner at any time or at any place. . . . There are housing conditions all over the United States which cannot be tolerated in a civilized community."[1]

In recent visits to the slums of New York, Cleveland, Detroit, St. Louis and Toledo the writer found overcrowding, dark rooms never reached by a ray of sunlight, basement and cellar dwellings, insanitary and insufficient toilets, privy vaults, lack of water, exorbitant rents and many other evils. He often found shanties in small towns as bad as the slums of the large cities. Discord and misery abound in such poverty. Leisure and rest in such hovels are often impossible and the children are driven onto the crowded streets, exposed to the attractions

[1] Edith Elmer Wood, "The Housing of the Unskilled Wage Earner," pp. 34, 91, 132.

of cheap and often pernicious commercialized amusements as the only available outlet for their dull, drab lives. In the homes of the poor we find the beginnings of those tendencies which in the exceptional cases lead to suicide or crime, to disabling disease and helplessness, to friendlessness and public dependence. Let us ask, if in cities like Vienna they are abolishing their slums and building an abundance of homes for the poor, renting for one and two dollars a month, with a balance in their city budget at the end of the year, why the richest cities in the world like New York refuse to abolish their disgraceful slums but keep them for heartless profiteering.

Sickness and Death.—The amount of sickness is far greater among the poor than among other classes. The impaired physique resulting from poverty and defective housing frequently takes the form of chronic ill health. J. B. Hurry in "Poverty and Its Vicious Circles" shows that "unfitness of the workman means low wages, low wages means insufficient food, insufficient food

unfitness for labor, so that the vicious circle is complete."[1]

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company has found that the life expectation of industrial workers is eight years less than that of office workers.[2] The driving factory wears out the workers. It scraps human beings as it scraps machinery. Modern industry tends to become like Frankenstein's monster that consumes men, early wastes the energies of their prime and often leaves them old and almost useless before the age of fifty. Dr. Fritz Wittels in "An End of Poverty" contrasts the ten millions killed upon the battlefields of the world war with the far larger number destroyed over a longer space of time, by poverty. "The economic war of the last hundred years has swallowed up thirty-six billion years of human life."[3]

The investigation conducted by the United States Commission on Industrial Relations found that "the babies of the poor died at three times

---

[1] J. B. Hurry, "Poverty and Its Vicious Circles," pp. 22, 81.
[2] "Social Progress," p. 9.
[3] "An End to Poverty," p. 77.

the rate of those who were in fairly well-to-do families."[1]

MOTHERS AND CHILDREN IN INDUSTRY.—"In the families of the workers 37 per cent of the mothers are at work. . . . A large part of our industrial population are, as a result of the combination of low wages and unemployment, living in conditions of actual poverty. . . . It is certain that at least one-third and possibly one-half of the families of wage earners employed in manufacturing and mining earn in the course of the year less than enough to support them in anything like a comfortable and decent condition."[2]

Poverty drives the mother into industry. She is forced to be absent from the home. Because of overwork the mother's health is frequently threatened. Left in enforced ignorance regarding birth-control, unwanted children are born

---

[1] "Senate Document 415," p. 23. Studies of infant mortality made by the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor indicate that the children of poor parents had a death rate from two to nearly seven times as great as those of families on the comfort level. It was highest in the midst of room-crowding and among the children of wage-earning mothers.

[2] "Senate Document 415," pp. 22, 24.

often lacking in vitality. The growing children, uncared for at home or driven upon the streets, frequently contract vicious habits; juvenile delinquency follows. Unemployment and poverty often pave the way to crime. Dire necessity drives the children from the school into industry at the earliest legal age. Child labor in turn exacts its toll of ill health, lowered mentality and morals. Thus the vicious circle of poverty is maintained. Secretary of Labor Davis states that "approximately a million and a half American boys and girls of school age are to-day thrown beneath the wheels of the juggernaut of industry, pressed to labor before their time, doomed to the drudgery of mine and factory by economic necessity. They face a hopeless future. Before them stretches the treadmill of unremunerative labor with a few years of heart-breaking, soul-searing toil and at the end—a grave."

Vice and Crime.—Poverty is the parent of crime. As the ancient Chinese proverb testifies, "crime begins in poverty." This seems to be verified by the experience of American penal

institutions. "The pressure of economic conditions has an enormous influence in producing certain types of crime. Insanitary housing and working conditions, unemployment, wages inadequate to maintain a human standard of living inevitably produce the crushed or distorted bodies and minds from which the army of crime is recruited."[1] A large proportion of crime springs from juvenile delinquency and is often the result of poverty.

A survey made in Japan revealed that eighty per cent of the women in the ranks of prostitution were recruited from among the daughters of the poor, most of them driven into this life by their poverty. There is evidence that the proportion would probably not be greatly different in our own country. Whatever may be true of other parts of the country, a committee of the Illinois Senate in an elaborate report on vice in January, 1916, thus state their first three findings with regard to "the social disease of prostitution": "(1) Poverty is the principal cause,

[1] "Report of Commission on Industrial Relations," p. 24.

direct and indirect, of prostitution. (2) Thousands of girls are driven into prostitution because of the sheer inability to keep body and soul together on the low wages received by them. (3) Thousands of girls are forced into industrial employment by the low wages received by their fathers; they are separated from proper home influences at an exceedingly early age; they are inadequately schooled and insufficiently protected; and many of them become recruits for the system of prostitution." The committee was unable to learn of "a single prostitute in any city of Illinois visited over which its investigations operated who had come from a home of even moderate prosperity." The Bureau of Social Hygiene "arrives at the conservative figure of approximately 200,000 women in the regular army of vice."[1]

In the light of this brief and inadequate review of the effects of poverty it seems hardly too much still to say with Ovid centuries ago, "The poor man is everywhere downtrodden."

---

[1] "Prostitution in the United States," p. 88.

Poverty is itself the chief cause of that helpless dependence, weakness and inefficiency which are in turn the causes of continued poverty. Their poverty, their ignorance, their superstitious fears and, perhaps more than all, the apathy that comes with a broken spirit, bind them in their place and to their fate. The writer of Proverbs well sums up their condition, "The rich man's wealth is his strong city: the destruction of the poor is their poverty."[1] Still is it true that "man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn."

Remembering the individual responsibility of each of us who has, for his neighbor who has not, how far do we sympathize with the poor in the spirit of Carlyle? "It is not because of his toils that I lament for the poor. We must all toil. . . . But what I do mourn over is, that the lamp of his soul should go out, that no ray of heavenly, or even earthly, knowledge should visit him; but only, in the haggard darkness, like two spectres, Fear and Indignation bear

[1] Proverbs 10:15.

him company. Alas, while the body stands so broad and brawny, must the soul lie blinded, dwarfed, stupefied, almost annihilated."

THE EFFECTS OF LUXURY.—It is sometimes urged in defense of luxuries that such expenditures "make work" for the poor. Rather they take bread out of the mouths of the poor. Luxuries divert human labor and tie up capital which might have been employed in the production of necessities and might thus have decreased the cost of living for the poor. Luxuries also consume raw materials which might have been better employed. They are a contributing cause to the high prices of necessities, which in turn are in part responsible for enforced unemployment. Ex-President Hadley of Yale says, "The man who spends money in employing laborers on things that are really useless causes food to be consumed by a group of workers who leave nothing permanent to show for it, and lessens the amount of useful things which the consumer can enjoy in the immediate future. He usually does more harm than the man who

saves money and hoards it; for while hoarding chiefly affects nominal wages, unwise expenditure affects real wages." The English economist, Mr. Hartley Withers, writes, "Since the producing power of mankind is limited, every superfluous and useless article that they buy, every extravagance that they commit, prevents the production of the necessaries of life for those who are at present in need of them. . . . In other words, every purchase of an article of luxury stiffens the price of articles of necessity, and makes the struggle of the poor still harder."[1] According to ex-Secretary of the Treasury Houston, ten million workers in this country were engaged in producing goods and services that lie almost completely outside simple human necessities.

The grossly unequal and unjust distribution of wealth and income which leaves concentrated wealth unshared side by side with poverty unre-

[1] Hartley Withers, "Poverty and Waste," pp. 19, 20, 21. Living the simple life and giving away or sharing one's surplus with others even if practiced on a large scale could not throw workers permanently out of employment but would transfer them to other more socially necessary and useful industries. See "What Can a Man Afford?" Chapter I, by Professor Paul H. Douglas.

lieved is poisonous and pernicious in its ultimate effects on the majority of the very rich and the very poor alike. For the rich, in a large number of cases, there naturally results increased expenditure on personal comforts and luxuries. We would define luxury as expenditure which is not necessary for a person's highest spiritual efficiency. There follows, all too often, the creeping paralysis of a subtle selfishness.

At the other end of the scale are the impoverished lives of those in want. Whether we know it or not, many of us are living on the backs of the poor. We are willing, or at least we think we are, to do almost anything for them, except the one thing that they need, as Tolstoi pointed out, *to get off their back.*

An inevitable result of this grossly unjust and unequal distribution of wealth, with its twin results of waste and of want, is the gulf which it sets between man and his neighbor, between classes, between races and nations. It sharply divides life between rich and poor, those who have and those who have not, those who own the means of production and those who depend

upon them. This in turn results in inevitable strife between economic classes, races and nations, and this strife culminates in periodic war. Our economic system now largely controls the earth, its industry, its raw materials and markets, its credit and means of exchange, its political government, its educational and religious institutions, almost the entire life of the planet.

Wealth unshared isolates, segregates, insulates life. It creates inevitable divisions. This inequality and injustice is a fruitful cause of bitterness and hostility on the part of the workers. Such wealth in the hands of the few and the suffrage in the hands of the many, such concentration of financial power and diffusion of political power constitute a real danger for all save those who are too blind to see.

Another result of this separation of the rich and the poor is the increase of gross materialism that we find at both ends of the social scale. God and spiritual values are crowded out. Money becomes the false standard of the materialized life. There follows a false view of

work, of worth, of leisure, of success, of life itself. This materialization of wealth produces a lower standard of morals, founded not upon character but upon money. Under the extremes of pampered wealth and dreary poverty marriage more frequently breaks down and the home disintegrates. Sexual immorality and divorce increase. The sons of the rich and the daughters of the poor often both fall before an artificial and intensified sex stimulus.

The possession of large wealth tends to produce a false sense of security and pride in the rich, while extreme poverty begets a haunting sense of insecurity and fear on the part of the poor. Large wealth often has a hardening and deadening effect upon its possessors. "It substitutes patronage for fraternity, arrogance for humility, indolence for effort, vanity for love, the spirit of submission for the spirit of independence, an artificial class society for a natural society of mutual respect and affection. It saps vitality by surfeit and superabundance, and at the same time stunts healthy development by

misery and want. Greed and Cupidity are its parents, Envy and Jealousy its children."[1]

And yet, though we deplore this situation, are not most of us feverishly engaged in promoting this very system or preparing to enter and gain its devastating "success"?

THE TEACHING OF JESUS.—In the light of the extremes of wealth and poverty which our country presents, and of the effects of poverty upon the poor, and of luxury, extravagance and waste upon the rich, let us now examine the teaching of Jesus upon the subject of wealth and poverty. Let us make the effort of coming to the record with fresh minds, as though we had never seen it.

Aristotle, three centuries before, maintained that a certain modest amount of private property was necessary for the development, the expression and the fulfillment of personality. Jesus also recognizes or implies the need, the benefit, and right of personal property. Men

[1] Arthur Ponsonby, "The Camel and the Needle's Eye," pp. 179-183.

are bidden to pray for daily bread and for all necessary sustenance for the simple life; they are told that their heavenly Father knows that they have need of all these things, which will be supplied for those who lead the life of service to which he calls them.[1] His company of followers kept a modest supply of money for necessities.[2] Some of them were persons of position and means who were apparently never told to sell their possessions.[3] But Jesus repeatedly warns against the pursuit and the possession of wealth as both dangerous and harmful.

Let us begin with the basic teaching of Jesus upon the subject of wealth given in the Sermon on the Mount, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth."[4]

Jesus here seems to forbid the selfish accumulation of wealth upon these grounds. Hoarded wealth or accumulated treasure *is perishable, it is absorbing, it is enslaving.* It is perishable,

---

[1] Matt. 6:11, 32-34. Peter had apparently retained his house and belongings after he had become a follower of Jesus. Mark 1:16-18, 29; 2:1; Luke 5:1-11; John 21:3.
[2] Mark 6:37; John 4:8, 12:6, 13:29, etc.
[3] Luke 8:3; Matthew 27:57.
[4] Matt. 5:19-34, 7:12, 24.

for the security which it seems to offer and which tends to take the place of spiritual dependence is a house built upon sand. Moth and rust consume, thieves break through and steal. As a material foundation of life it is uncertain and it is false. But, more important, it is absorbing; it is diverting. Where your treasure is there will be your heart, your interest, your attention, your growing concern. You start out to get money but it soon gets you. It tends to enslave, to overpower you. It becomes your master.

No man can have two masters. He cannot really be loyal to two contradicting and mutually exclusive, dominant interests. "Ye cannot serve God and money."[1] On the one hand there is a life absorbed in the making of men, in the building of a spiritual family of love by the full sharing of life. On the other there is the making of money, by the saving or hoarding of it, which means the withholding of it from human needs. Jesus says a man may do either but he

[1] Mammon is simply the Aramaic word for riches. Matt. 6:24.

cannot do both. He can make money or he can make men; he can share or withhold. Or, he may make an attempt at compromise by keeping most of it and sharing a pittance as a salve to his conscience. But in the main current of his life he goes on making money and getting riches; or else making men in spiritual enrichment for all. Either then his eye, or purpose in life, will be single, generous, devoted to the cause of God and man; or it will be double, divided, compromised or selfish. He must choose the material life or the spiritual, the cause of humanity or selfish accumulation.

From the very outset the teaching of Jesus searches like a fire, or pierces and divides like a two-edged sword. At once we are tempted to dilute, to compromise, to tone it down to the convenient and easy level of our own practice. John Stuart Mill suggests in one passage that we do not take Jesus seriously in such teaching. We do not think he meant what he said. He must have intended only the conventional practice of our social group. If he said, "lay not

up," "give," "distribute," "share," of course he must really have meant the very opposite!

Wealth is a means, never an end. It is a medium of exchange, stored-up personality, to be used as a means to the single and sole end of the spiritual family. Therefore, if you would have some ready rule of action, some general principle of conduct, do to others just as you would have them do to you. As between the two basic human drives, of hunger and love, you already have in the first, in your own inevitable self-regard, a convenient yardstick for the measure of conduct. How would *you* like to be treated, what wages would you like to receive? Would you like to be left in helpless dependence, in haunting fear without means of livelihood, with no home of your own, no opportunity of rearing your children well educated for a satisfying and abundant life?

According to the teaching of Jesus, you must choose and choose to-day, and every day, with open eye and single, in the life-work you select, in the wages you pay, in the investments you make, whether you are going to live the creative

and functional life of sharing, or the acquisitive life of money-getting and spending on yourself.

Jesus follows the enunciation of his basic principle forbidding selfish accumulation with the illustrative parable of the foolish rich man.[1] A request to divide an inheritance raises the question of the real meaning and purpose of life. Jesus maintains that life does not consist in material things nor can it be measured or understood by the enjoyment of their possession. A certain rich man is making money, he is "succeeding." He decides to enlarge his facilities for the possession of yet greater wealth. But in the parable God replies, "Foolish man. Swiftly comes the end of this life, and not one cent can you take into the next. Your selfish life has been wasted in the acquisitive possession of material things that cannot satisfy you, while it is impoverished in the realm of the spiritual, in your relations to God and man."

If this is so, the meaning of life is not found in material but in spiritual possession. It is not

---

[1] Luke 12:13-22.

selfish but social; it is not temporal but eternal; it is realized not in hoarding but in sharing. The soul or self may be lost in the material; it can only be found in the spiritual.

Shortly after this in another parable, or illustration, Jesus contrasts with the hoarding of this "foolish" rich man a "wise" steward who so used his present position and possessions that he gained lasting and satisfying relationships.[1]

Jesus immediately follows this with the parable of Dives and Lazarus, pointing out the criminal wrong of wealth unshared, selfishly used, side by side with poverty unrelieved.[2] Waste and want, conspicuous luxury and bitter poverty, are dramatically pictured confronting each other. While the parable of the foolish rich man showed his relation to God, this shows one's responsibility for his fellow man. No other fault is even hinted at for Dives save that he had "fared sumptuously," without regard to the poor brother at his gate. While the world lasts, according to the teaching of Jesus, the rich are

[1] Luke 16:1-14.
[2] Luke 16:19-31.

bound to the poor by fetters of obligation that cannot be broken. The rich man is called upon to "remember" that he in his lifetime had received his "good things" which he had refused to share.

Ruskin in his essay on "Work" says that the contrast between Lazarus and Dives "exists more sternly in this day than ever in the world, pagan or Christian, until now." What then shall we say of our own country and time? As we have said elsewhere, "Jesus may visualize or dramatize for us a single Dives with Lazarus at his gate. But our present order has built long avenues where generic hundreds dwell whose surname is Dives. Hard by are hundreds of thousands desiring to be fed with the crumbs of privilege that fall from our surfeited lives—men and women who need only plain food, fresh air, the sunlight of God, security of life, regular employment, a living wage, education and development for each child, conditions of health, a fair chance for the pursuit of happiness—all that one could mean by 'the good life'."[1]

[1] "New Challenges to Faith," p. 228.

As we have contrasted Jesus' parable of the foolish rich man with the wise steward, let us now compare his teaching regarding the rich young ruler with his parable of the good Samaritan.

Eagerly in quest of life the rich young man runs to the Good Teacher ready to do some heroic thing.[1] He has meticulously kept the legal commands of his external religion. But, like many to-day, one essential thing he lacks. His possessions hold his heart. The false security of his unshared wealth segregates him alike from God and humanity, from spiritual vision and social service. In the face of humanity's need and the call of the "Good Master" to share with them, his very retention of his possessions for his own selfish use shows his heart is in them. He goes away sorrowful, unsatisfied. His possessions now possess him, yet they do not satisfy.

Then Jesus adds this searching challenge, "How difficult it is for those who have money to get into the Realm of God. . . . It is easier for a camel to get through the needle's eye than

[1] Mark 10:17-31.

for a rich man to get into the Realm of God" (Moffat's translation). Attachment to wealth seems to make men selfish and heartless toward their fellow men. It makes men cling to their possessions and turn their backs upon their fellow men. The very holding of wealth in the face of the unsatisfied needs of the destitute seems to Jesus an offense against the law of love. Wealth, in his view, makes it well-nigh impossible to be a true follower of Jesus' way of love which means the full sharing of life.[1]

When a certain lawyer, like the rich young man, wants to know the way of life the conditions are laid down of loving God and his neighbor as himself.[2] In reply to the question, "Who is my neighbor?" Jesus tells the story of the good Samaritan. A man half dead who had fallen among robbers is shunned by priest and Levite, but a Samaritan without ties of race or religion goes and shares his life with him. To

---

[1] "Whoso hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him? He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen cannot love God whom he hath not seen." I John 3:17, 4:20.

[2] Luke 10:25-37.

love one's neighbor apparently means to Jesus to meet his need by sharing what you have with him. Jesus' command then follows, "Go, and do thou likewise." All about us to-day are bruised and despoiled humanity. How much are we sharing with them and how much are we withholding from them?

Without pausing to quote from other passages where Jesus refers to the obligations of the rich and the needs of the poor, is it not evident to any candid and impartial student of the teaching of Jesus that he clearly and repeatedly forbids the selfish accumulation of wealth, that he warns against the folly and disaster of hoarding, while he exhorts men to be "wise" in using their possessions in immediately exchanging the material for the spiritual, the temporal for the eternal, the selfish for the social?

Could language frame a more terrible indictment than his against the selfish living of the rich in the face of the unrelieved wants of the poor? Could any warning be more solemn than his that it was well-nigh impossible for a rich

man to enter or have part in a Kingdom or family of love whose whole spirit was mutual sharing? Could anything be clearer than his "go and do likewise" in the service of the needy? Could he more fully identify himself with the poor than in saying, "I was an hungered and ye gave me meat. . . . Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me?"[1] Could language more explicitly teach the solemn obligation of stewardship or trusteeship, and the call to sell, to give, to share, to do to others as we would be done by?

Let us now inquire what effect his teaching had upon his early followers and then what effect it has had upon us.

A few days after his death, fresh from the influence of his teaching and example, we find his followers sharing their possessions in a simple, spiritual, voluntary communism. Following Moffat's translation, "The believers all kept together; they shared all they had with one another, they would sell their possessions and

---

[1] Matt. 25:32-40. See also James 5:1-6.

goods and distribute the proceeds among all, as anyone might be in need. . . . Now there was but one heart and soul among the multitude of the believers; not one of them considered anything his personal property, they shared all they had with one another. There was not a needy person among them, for those who owned land or houses would sell them and bring the proceeds of the sale, laying the money before the feet of the apostles; it was then distributed according to each individual's need."[1] The rightfulness of private property is here taken for granted. Their gifts were purely voluntary; they could give or withhold.[2] Labor is a duty; "if any man will not work, neither let him eat."[3]

C. J. Cadoux in "The Early Church and the World" records for us the attitude of the church of the early centuries upon the subject of wealth and poverty. From 70 to 110 A.D. in the later apostolic age, the early Christian attitude is still maintained. Throughout this period "wealth

---

[1] Acts 2:44, 45, 4:32-35, 5:1-4.
[2] Acts 5:4, 4:36.
[3] II Thessalonians 3:10.

still retained in Christian eyes something of a stigma, and poverty on the other hand was regarded as the more befitting condition for a Christian."

In the Epistle of Barnabas we read, "Thou shalt have all things common with thy neighbor, and not call them thy *private property,* for if ye hold the imperishable things in common how much more the perishable."[1] Clement says: "The common life, brethren, is necessary to all, and chiefly to those who desire to serve God irreproachably, and who would imitate the life of the Apostles, and their disciples. For the use of all things that are in this world ought to be common to all men. But by iniquity, one says this to be his, and another that, and so among mortals division is produced."[2] According to Clement, luxury "is not human, nor is it in keeping with the idea of common possession." "God led the race of man to brotherly community. . . . Say not, 'I possess it, why should I not enjoy it?' But rather, 'I possess it, why

[1] Epistle of Barnabas, xix, 8.
[2] Clemens, Romanus, Epistola v. Migne, Patrologiæ Series Græca. S. Clemens, i, p. 506.

should I not impart it?' . . . According to God's will enjoyment must be common. It is not right that one should live in superfluity, while many are in want. And how much better is it to be a benefactor to many, than to possess a splendid house; how much wiser to spend one's wealth on men than on jewels."[1]

Expenditure only for necessities is everywhere counted a principle in this period. Simplicity, contentment, and moderation are required of every Christian. Luxury was condemned as a heathen vice. The mark of the Christian was the simple life.

From 110 to 180 A.D., during the period of the earlier apologists, the writers recognize the right of property but preserve the traditional Christian attitude of aversion to wealth and the denunciation of the love of money. Christianity was still the religion of the poor. Though no communistic community was attempted except in the primitive church at Jerusalem, Justin says that Christians shared their property with

[1] Pedagogus. II:12. See Uhlhorn, "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church," p. 131.

one another: "We carry on us all we possess, and share everything with the poor."[1] Early in the second century Cyprian, the great leader in the Church in North Africa, a man of wealth, at his conversion sold all his property and distributed the proceeds to the poor. He maintained that Christians should have all things common so as "truly to become sons of God by spiritual birth; this is to imitate by the heavenly law the equity of God the Father."[2] The brilliant Tertullian holds the same view, "We have everything in common except our wives. . . . Each one freely brings his offering to relieve the poor, the sick, orphans, widows, travelers and prisoners. . . . We love one another; we are brothers."[3]

During the period of the great thinkers, from 180 to 250 A.D., the leading writers maintain the rightfulness of a moderate amount of property, but they demand the simple life without anxiety for worldly possessions. As a growing number become well-to-do the theory of property begins to exercise thinkers of this period. Origen re-

[1] Justin, "Apologia," I, 14.
[2] Cyprian, "Treatise on Works and Alms," sec. 25.
[3] Apologeticus.

gards property as a kind of necessary evil and Irenæus as little better than permitted theft. There is a strong denunciation of excessive wealth, luxury, worldliness and hoarding.

When, following the accession of Constantine, the Church gained power over the state and might have shaped legislation and reform for the alleviation of injustice, it had so far lost the social vision and passion which characterized the teaching of Jesus that it had no program to offer.[1] A few high-minded souls, however, maintained the early ideals almost unbroken throughout the centuries and even in the dark ages the ideals of the simple life and of voluntary poverty and sharing were kept alive in the monasteries. Space forbids the use of more than a few passages out of many hundreds that could be given.

Thus St. Augustine, the great father of the Latin Church, who lived a common life of vol-

[1] Lecky says, "In the first two centuries of the Christian Church, the moral elevation was extremely high, and was continually appealed to as a proof of the divinity of the creed"; while "the two centuries after Constantine are uniformly represented by the Fathers as a period of general and scandalous vice." "History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne," Vol. ii, pp. 12-13.

untary poverty with his clergy, writes: "Private property has then no right in nature, but is a right granted by law. Private property is the cause of lawsuits, duels, revolutions, party feuds, scandals, sins, injustice and murders, and so let us keep from private property altogether, or if that is impracticable, at least from the love of it."[1]

John Chrysostom (344-407), the greatest preacher of ancient times, gave up his property at his conversion to Christianity and lived in poverty. He so attacked the luxury of the court in Constantinople that he was thrice banished and finally died of hardship in exile. He cries, "Behold, the idea we should have of the rich and covetous! They are truly as robbers, who, standing in the public highways, despoil the passers-by; they convert their chambers into caverns, in which they bury the goods of others."[2]

For twelve centuries various groups maintained the teaching and practice of the simple life, of voluntary poverty and sometimes of a

[1] Augustine, Vol. v., p. 99.
[2] St. John Chrysostom, De Lazaro, contio, i.

communal life. They were frequently persecuted, as in the case of the Lollards of England, the Taborites in Bohemia, the Beghards in Holland and Germany, the Waldenses in Southern France, the Anabaptists in Moravia, and others.

John Wycliffe (1320-1384) in his "Civil Dominion" claims that the right of the unjust man to property is contrary to the first principles of law, lordship or service, "Not our theory of community of goods, but the possession of the unrighteous involves theft."[1]

This almost unbroken body of teaching in the church was taken up in the modern cry for social justice, as the "soul" in the early religious community became the citizen in the new state. Thus Rousseau maintains, "The first man who, having fenced off a piece of ground, could think of saying, 'This is mine,' and found people simple enough to believe him, was the real founder of civil society. How many crimes, wars, murders, miseries, and horrors would have been spared the human race by one who, plucking up

[1] R. Heath, "The Captive City of God," p. 143.

the stakes, or filling in the trench, should have called out to his fellows: 'Beware of listening to this impostor. You are undone if you forget that the earth belongs to no one and that its fruits are for all.' "[1] It was by Rousseau and Locke that Thomas Jefferson and the signers of the Declaration of Independence were inspired to maintain the right of all to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

ATTEMPTED SOLUTIONS.—Our study thus far has shown that we have in America, in addition to a large and prosperous economic middle class, congested fortunes of vast wealth for the few, with their consequent power over the lives of the dispossessed many in their helpless dependence. We have seen the debilitating and debasing effects of poverty upon the poor and of luxury and waste upon the rich. Such an unhealthy and unnecessary condition of things stands challenged by the principles of religion and condemned at the bar of reason.

Since a large proportion of the prosperous

[1] "Discourse on Inequality."

possessors of wealth in this country profess allegiance to the Christian religion, we reviewed the teaching of Jesus upon the subject of wealth and found that he categorically forbade selfish accumulation and taught the principle of responsible stewardship. We find in the teaching of Jesus no absolute mechanical, repressive rules of life, but a single, dynamic and expansive principle of sharing, which is claimed by many to be capable of universal application in every age and under varying conditions.

What would it mean in our own time in America if some should seek a rediscovery of God and of humanity and should take seriously this central principle of Jesus concerning the full sharing of life? We shall probably find, since we are not dealing with a mechanical rule, that there is no one way but that there are as many possible applications of the principle as there are men who seriously seek to apply it. Let us examine a few typical cases of those who have attempted a tentative solution of the economic problem by the personal application of the above principle.

AN ILLUSTRATION OF STEWARDSHIP.—As illustrative of the fundamental principle of the sharing of life applied to stewardship, we may take the case of Mr. A. A. Hyde of Kansas. He began business in banking and real estate in Wichita and soon made a fortune. At that time, although prominent in church life, Mr. Hyde had not learned the great joy of bountiful giving. When in the early eighties drouth and grasshoppers devastated Kansas, he was left a hundred thousand dollars in debt. He had mortgaged his home to meet obligations, but these reverses he says were really a great blessing for they led him to study the Bible carefully, as he sought to discover the real meaning of life. Soon he resolved literally to follow the command of the Sermon on the Mount, "lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth." About 1892 he began manufacturing Mentholatum, and after some years of hard struggle, was enabled to pay his debts. He began giving freely of his income and resolved to store his surplus treasure by investing it in humanity rather than seeking to make increasing financial investments.

His heart's affections have gone with his treasures, for the advancement of the Kingdom of God on earth has in recent years become the central aim and ambition of his life. Those who know his affairs say there will be virtually no estate left to administer when he leaves this life. Recognizing that all he had belonged to God, he began by tithing his income, but for many years now he has been giving to Christian causes in hard times from seventy to eighty per cent of his income, and in normal times ninety per cent.

The writer went to him one year at the close of December. A certain organization was facing a deficit and the facts were laid before him. He said, "Why does not everyone experience the great joy of giving? I am sorry, but all I have in the bank just now is $15,000. When your last day comes, if you are still short that much, draw on me for all I have up to that sum." When the day came, there was a shortage of $10,000 and his generous gift enabled the organization to close the year without a deficit. On the occasion of his seventy-seventh birthday

some three thousand of his fellow citizens gathered, with representative men from coast to coast, to do him honor. One speaker said, "I could not name one of the fifty-eight nations of the world which I have traveled over in the past twenty years, where I have not seen the great influences which have come forth from the life of A. A. Hyde."

Of his early failure in business and subsequent quest of the true meaning of life, Mr. Hyde writes, "That was the greatest blessing to me and my children. I saw that laying up material wealth in this world did not bring satisfaction, but brought instead suspicion and distrust of my fellow man. I realized that accumulated wealth was a source of worry and tended to shorten life, and was really deleterious to character."

Mr. Hyde believes that war and the monstrous conditions resulting from our present social order are clearly demonstrating that a return to Jesus' way of life is the world's one hope. He believes that the church must take his teachings far more seriously than it has in the

past. As a Christian steward, he is concerned not only with how he gives his money, but with how he makes it. He believes not only in philanthropy and in sharing with the community, but in doing justice to his employees. He does not believe that the robbery of predatory wealth can be even partially atoned for by lavish "charity." His chief concern is not to make or to give money but to make men, by the full sharing of all his life with them. He believes that loyalty to and earnest work for the wide Kingdom of God is the highest motive for life.

AN ILLUSTRATION OF VOLUNTARY POVERTY.—How utterly various may be the applications of the single principle of love as the sharing of life, is shown when we pass from Mr. Hyde as the type of the successful business man as steward and generous giver, to the man who follows the way of voluntary poverty. Typical of this class we may select "Bill" Simpson as a modern Francis of Assisi. In citing him as an example of one possible application of this universal principle of love, it is not implied that we agree

with his entire philosophy of life nor with every detail of its application. There are those, like children in the market place, who would complain of any who do not dance when they pipe, or who do not conform a hundred per cent to our present social order—or disorder; but it may not be amiss to have some one challenge that smug complacency of our sordid civilization as did Francis in his day.

"Bill" Simpson, as he is affectionately called by the students who know him, was graduated with honors from Lafayette College in 1912 and from Union Seminary in 1915. Refusing a call to a "solid mahogany" church near Philadelphia, he became the minister of a small congregation in an industrial center in New Jersey. Here he felt the dead weight of the control of the money power over the community and the crushing out of the higher values of human life. The world war marked a crisis in his experience. He felt its causes lay deep in our unjust economic order, in economic imperialism, in the exploitation of men in the interests of money. He finally took his stand as a pacifist, opposed the war, in 1918

he gave up his church, and two years later left the ministry.

At this period the reading of the life of St. Francis led him to enter the life of voluntary poverty. In the summer of 1919 in order to enter into the experience of men in labor, he worked his way across the continent, laboring in factories, mines, mills and lumber camps. He became convinced that a new spiritual and social order would come not by a change of system but by a change of heart. Finally he felt the urge to go the whole way in following the Franciscan ideal, and after a month of solitude he parted with all his possessions and began to work as a carpenter. Like Francis, possessing literally not one cent, and refusing to take or to touch money, he sought to make his labor a gift, trusting that love would call forth in others an answering love sufficient to provide for his simple needs, in a life care-free like that of Jesus or Francis. He does not beg but works with his own hands. He and a few associates who are now with him have been working in northwest New Jersey and around Easton,

Pennsylvania. He speaks on street corners, in churches, colleges and forums. Several times the officials of our social order have found no place where he could fit into it, save in jail. For good or ill, there is a vein of asceticism running through his philosophy as in the case of Buddha, Francis, Tolstoi and Gandhi. His philosophy of life will be found in a pamphlet entitled "The Community of Love."[1]

An Illustration of Democracy in Industry.—A third type of an attempted solution or application of the general principle of the sharing of life is found in democracy in industry. Here the aim is not to make money and give it away, not to dispossess oneself of property in voluntary poverty, but to enrich all who are associated with one in productive labor by sharing with them both the profits and the management of industry. As typical of this class we shall take the case of William P. Hapgood,

[1] "The Community of Love" obtainable from William Simpson, 292 Maple Avenue, Wallington (Passaic), New Jersey.

President of the Columbia Conserve Company of Indianapolis.[1]

A decade ago, in 1917, William P. Hapgood conceived the idea of turning industry from a battle ground into a brotherhood by applying the principle of coöperation. He called his workers together and they accepted the proposed plan, though at first with some skepticism. A plant council was elected by the workers and no subject was excluded from its consideration. Only in the beginning Mr. Hapgood retained the power of veto. In 1921 the council was widened to include all salaried employees who attended eight consecutive meetings; and in 1923 any employee could become a member by attendance at a meeting. A reconsideration of any question can be called for by the workers if in their judgment an unwise decision has been reached and only those members can then vote who have served a year or more on the council. The workers themselves now really manage the business. They not only determine

[1] The Columbia Conserve Company has been in operation since 1903, as a canning industry capitalized at $400,000, doing a business of approximately $1,000,000 a year.

their own wages, hours and conditions of work, but the general policies of the business. The aim is a complete absence of all paternalism and the cultivation of a genuine industrial democracy. The wages are now more than double what they were at the beginning. The workers in council finally agreed upon a living wage for all workers and placed all permanent employees upon a salary basis, providing for a guaranteed income, an annual vacation and security of employment, so that no salaried employee can now be dismissed except by action of the council.

Out of the profits of the business 7 per cent is first paid on the preferred stock. Out of the remaining profits a cumulative dividend of 10 per cent is paid on the common stock and the same percentage to the workers on their payroll. Ten per cent of the remainder is then set aside for a pension fund. All the remaining profit goes to the employees as a group, being used to buy outstanding common stock. This stock is held by the council in a trust fund, the workers receiving the dividends from the stock. The ownership of the business will pass into the

hands of the council when they have purchased 51 per cent of the common stock. After a decade of successful operation the workers are proving that men can be trusted, for production per man, per hour, has been doubled and the plant is 150 per cent more efficient economically than in 1917.

Mr. Hapgood's attempted solution is thus utterly different from the others previously considered. While Mr. Hapgood accepts the ethics of Jesus and bases his business upon the principle "love one another," he is not a member of any organized church, for he has not yet found a church that he believes takes seriously the application of Christian principles to industry. He does not think that Christians, save in rare exceptions, are seriously in earnest in the social application of the principles of Jesus to actual life.

A Universal Obligation.—The cases we have cited above vary widely among themselves, and there are in addition to them almost an indefinite number of varying solutions. They

are cited to illustrate the single principle of the sharing of life for the common good. Each of them in his own way has not only made his individual contribution, but has furnished a contagious example which has already been followed by others. For this seems to be the way of human progress as history repeats itself. The new truth is first vouchsafed to one who incarnates it in his own life-experience. It is then incorporated and lived out in a coöperating social group. It is finally carried in a crusade to the multitude; the mass of men slowly receive the new truth and humanity rises to a higher level.

Is there not need to-day, urgent and imperative need, of realizing this principle of the responsible stewardship of all life, of coöperative sharing for the common good? Some have already made their contribution in tentative solutions, in showing the possibilities in the practical application of this principle of life. Are we also ready to acknowledge our responsibility? Are we ready to do our part?

Here is humanity all about us in its desperate

need. We have seen the debilitating effects of poverty upon the poor, and the pernicious results of luxury for the rich. Those of us who profess to believe in religion have faced the searching teaching of Jesus, and the practice of his early followers. One and all, whatever our faith, we face the inescapable indictment of reason with regard to our responsibility for present conditions and the obligation to share our lives with those in need.

What then shall I do? Is there for me any alibi or reprieve, any justification for excuse or evasion? Am I free from the claims of God and man, of duty and responsibility? Have I the right to live the parasitic life of selfish privilege unshared, at the expense of another, or of many others, denied the bare means of the simple life? Have I the right to live at the cost of my brother's welfare? Have I the right to enjoy luxury if its price is literally malnutrition, sickness and death for others?

If I then have no right to break this central, fundamental law of life, am I ready to eliminate all needless luxury and waste in my personal

expenditure and to share my life, my possessions, my privilege, my time and my talents for the welfare of my fellow men? If I am, in the light of such examples as were cited above, what concrete steps am I ready to take to begin to live this life? If I am not willing to do so, by what pretense can I call myself a follower of a crucified Christ? Is it not almost blasphemous to profess to be his follower if I deliberately and flagrantly deny the clear teaching and example of his life? If I insist on my selfish privileges at the price of the robbery of the despoiled poor, am I then really a Christian? Nay, more, am I human? What am I before God and man?

Am I also willing to apply these principles in my life work whether or not I have already begun it? Am I to engage in the calling which presents the largest opportunity for profit or for service, for the making of money or the making of men? There was never a time when both offered such large opportunities as to-day. Unless you are a man in a million, unless you have the rare creative genius of the inventor or

organizer, like Henry Ford or Herbert Hoover, there are probably three principal ways that you can make a large fortune, the three ways in which most of the big fortunes of to-day have been made.

First, you may make money by monopoly. You may be able to corner exclusively for yourself or a small group some of the resources of the earth—the land, the oil, the coal, the minerals, the electricity, the water-power—the vital human necessities which are needed by and presumably intended for all men. By superior ability, or force, or "influence" you may be able to seize for yourself and exclude others from the wealth wrung from the necessities of your fellow men.

Or, you may amass a fortune for yourself by the exploitation of labor, or by the less crude method of taking a disproportionately large share of the profits gained by selling the consumer an article he needs. You may take such a portion of the wage of every man who works for you, that, while the majority of your workers will never in fact own a home of their own

or have any abundant or good life, you may make a large fortune for yourself and live in luxury at their expense. You may use the workers as means to your own ends. Long ago Rauschenbusch pointed out that he who uses a woman to gratify his own selfish desire, regardless of her worth or welfare, prostitutes that woman; and similarly, he who uses a man to gratify his own selfish desire for wealth, regardless of his worth or welfare, prostitutes that man. Seldom has there been a greater opportunity thus to make money than to-day.

Or, finally, you may make a large fortune in big business in "high finance." You may win a fortune in stock gambling. Or, you may amass wealth by bankers' control where, in the reorganization of a company, you may make a hundred per cent on millions, where you will gain more for yourself in a day than a multitude who have toiled for years by hand and brain in honest and intelligent production.

All of these three ways have yielded large fortunes in the past and in the further concentration of wealth may yield yet larger fortunes

in the future. But pause and ask yourself just what do the scriptures and what do the church fathers of the early centuries call it? Do they describe it as legitimate private profit or do they often use the ugly word "robbery"? Is this scripture wholly out of date in our own day:

"Come now, you rich men, weep and shriek over your impending miseries! You have been storing up treasure in the very last days; and your wealth lies rotting, and your clothes are moth-eaten; your gold and silver lie rusted over, and their rust will be evidence against you, it will devour your flesh like fire.

"See the wages of which you have defrauded the workmen who mowed your fields call out, and the cries of the harvesters have reached the ears of the Lord of Hosts. You have revelled on earth and plunged into dissipation; you have fattened yourselves as for the Day of Slaughter."[1]

Social Justice in Industry.—We have endeavored to apply the principles of social justice and of the sharing of privileges to the

[1] James, 5:1-6. Moffatt's Translation.

question of personal expenditures and the simple life. Let us now ask what would it mean to apply these principles to industry and business, at the crucial center of our economic life, where these problems must ultimately be solved.

Is the final *purpose* of industry and business the making of money or the making of men? Should the ultimate *motive* in industry be private profit or public service? Should the *method* of industry be a *laissez-faire* competition or growing coöperation? Should the dominating *spirit* in industry be the rule of gold or the golden rule? Should the *conduct* of industry be autocratic or democratic? Let us briefly consider each of these questions in turn.

May we say at the outset that we discuss these industrial problems in no spirit of pessimism. We do not despair of finding a peaceful solution. We believe in men; in all classes of men. We believe in employers and in labor. There are bad employers and ruthless labor leaders, but we believe that both are the exception and both are the product of an unnatural environment. Given a fair chance, most em-

ployers and employees alike want to do the right thing. We have a high admiration for those large-hearted pioneers in industry who are trying to solve these great and difficult human problems. On the other hand we hold no brief for the selfish employer or the unprincipled labor leader. We believe that the laborer should give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. Too often trade unions have failed to coöperate with employers in the matter of efficient production, and have been unmindful of the interests of the public. Sometimes labor leaders have been guilty of actually obstructing and limiting production, and in some cases have caused the financial failure of important enterprises. In other cases unprincipled walking delegates who have no concern in the prosperity of industry have artificially stimulated strife and discord among the workers. Other leaders have yielded to bribery, have faithlessly broken contracts, or have resorted to intimidation and actual violence. Such men are the workers' worst enemies. Where such evils exist organized labor must set its own house in order before it can claim the

sympathy and coöperation of employers and the public.

In the following pages illustrations are used of employers who are endeavoring to meet the workers half way in full coöperation. Apology must be made for the use of names that are so well known. If they are familiar to the reader this section may be omitted. Unfortunately, however, the number of these men is so limited that we are unable to select fresh illustrations of men who have gone the whole way in such coöperation with labor.

1. The Purpose of Industry.—What is a man in business for? What is the purpose of industry? Is it ultimately to make money or to make men? Is a man in business "for his health," or for our health, for his workers and for the whole community? Is the primary object of industry to enable a man to amass a fortune and to gain material comforts and power for himself, or is it to help in providing the material basis of a more abundant life for all? In a word, is the purpose of industry self-

ish or social, is it money-grabbing or the making of manhood?

Without attempting to theorize, let us take the case of Mr. Seebohm Rowntree of England, as an illustration of a man who is in business not primarily for the making of money but the making of men. He employs some seven thousand workers in his factory in York, England. As evidence of his aim might be cited the fact that he is not a rich man to-day, but that he has in measure enriched his workers. For fifty years over half the profits of the firm have been "plowed back," not into increased capitalization, but into labor, invested in education, scientific investigation, a model village, an effort to raise the standard of living and to share not only with his own employees, but in adult education with the workers of Britain. Making inevitably large war profits, he refused to touch one penny of this money, but turned it all back to be shared for the benefit of labor. Perhaps no employer in England, and few in the world, has given such painstaking investigation to industrial problems.

Facing the unsolved industrial problems of our time, Mr. Rowntree says there are three possible ways to secure industrial peace. The first is to make the employers all-powerful. But he maintains that the spirit of serfdom has gone with the war, and that this cannot any longer be permanently successful. The second possible way is to secure a balance of power between federations of employers and workers, each endeavoring to make itself so strong that the other will not dare to take the offensive. This in some sections of industry is our present method but it is a perilous experiment, as was the trench warfare of 1914-18. The third and only remaining method is with open minds to explore the causes of unrest and to seek to remove them. Unrest is an industrial disease, and can only be remedied as a bodily disease is remedied—first by careful diagnosis of the causes producing it, and secondly by taking the steps necessary to remove them.

Mr. Rowntree says the worker should have: (1) earnings sufficient to maintain a reasonable standard of comfort; (2) reasonable hours of

work; (3) reasonable economic security during his whole working life and in old age; (4) a reasonable share with the employer in determining the conditions of work; (5) an interest in the prosperity of the industry in which he is engaged. He writes as follows: "The economic insecurity which characterizes our existing industrial system is probably more potent than any other factor in causing labor unrest. The fact that in modern industry it is the almost universal custom to dispense with workers, with no concern as to their immediate future, the moment the demand for their services ceases, gives force to the contention that labor is treated by employers merely as a chattel. That state of things, rightly or wrongly, is regarded by the workers as an injustice. I am sure that we shall never have industrial peace until we find some way of removing the menace of unemployment. I think it may be said that probably, on the average, over a period of years, about 95 per cent of the workers are employed and 5 per cent are unemployed. Therefore, even if the reserve of workers attached to an industry were to receive their full

wages when unemployed, the burden on the industry would only involve an addition of about 5 per cent to the wages bill. Such an unemployment insurance scheme might be administered by the State, or by industries, or by individual factories or groups of factories. The last method, which obviously would only be made use of in default of the others, has been adopted, with certain modifications, by my own firm.

"Now if we really want to bridge the gulf between Capital and Labor, and to replace the growing spirit of antagonism by a spirit of coöperation, I think we must definitely adopt some system whereby both parties are directly interested in industrial prosperity. I believe that all these conditions can be met without lowering the efficiency of industry. But I am convinced that we shall not obtain satisfactory results unless we apply the whole remedy. The moment is opportune, the need for action is urgent, and the initiative must be taken by employers."[1]

With such ideals practically applied, is not

[1] "Industrial Unrest: A Way Out," by Seebohm Rowntree, pp. 8-29. Pamphlet, George H. Doran Co., New York.

Mr. Rowntree a living witness to the fact that the chief purpose of industry may be made not the making of money but the making of men, by the sharing of all the benefits of life with them?

2. The Motive of Industry.—Should the dominant motive in industry be private profit or public service? Most practical business men maintain that profit is legitimate and necessary. A business cannot be run at a loss as a philanthropy. The question remains, however, to whom should the profit go and what should be the motive behind it? Should the dominant motive of the employer be profit or service, and should labor give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay? Schools and hospitals are not maintained because they yield financial dividends but because they meet a social need. Providing pure milk and better food for undernourished children in the slums and rebuilding squalid tenements will offer no inducements to the profiteer, but they must be provided by the community from the motive of service if public-spirited individuals will not do so. Commercialized vice and

the liquor traffic are not justified merely because they pay big dividends. In a word private profit can offer no ultimate test of life nor adequate motive for industry. Social use and public service must be our criterion.

Without attempting to argue the theoretical possibilities of the question, let us take the example of a man who actually rose from the domination of the profit motive to that of service. We shall take the case of John J. Eagan of Atlanta.

At the age of twenty-nine, Mr. Eagan had inherited a large fortune and in 1905 he became the chief organizer of the American Cast Iron Pipe Company of Birmingham, Alabama. He returned after the war, deeply troubled about the problems of social and racial injustice and especially about his own business. His first impulse was to give away his fortune and lead the simple life, but he came to the conclusion that the deepest need of our time was not for men to escape from business but to humanize it and to apply Christian principles to lift business from the profit to the service motive.

Finally he decided fully to share his life with his 1,500 workers. He said to the present writer one evening, "While hundreds in my employ are down below the level of a living wage, I have decided to take no more profits from my business until every man and woman in my employ has reached this standard of a living wage." As president of the company, taking a salary of only $3,000 to meet his personal needs when he might have taken many times that sum, he turned back at the end of the first year $425,000 in a single check as his share of the profits on the common stock, to be divided among his 1,500 employees, beginning with a bonus, from this and other funds, of a dollar a day, or $365 a year for each employee.

Before he had time to complete his plans, after a severe illness, Mr. Eagan died in May, 1924. By the terms of his will he left his entire holdings of the common stock, worth several million dollars, to the employees, to be held by the trustees, to insure to each worker a living wage, and to provide insurance against accident, sickness and unemployment.

As you stand in the dust and din of that great iron foundry, it is with the feeling that the place whereon you stand is holy ground, just as when you stand over the grave of David Livingstone in Westminster Abbey. Here a man carried the principles of humanity and Christianity, not into darkest Africa, but into industry.

We read in the plant organ at the time of his death what the workers thought of John J. Eagan. "We tremble in awe at the faith he has shown in us. But we welcome humbly the responsibility, and we hail the opportunity to vindicate before God and man the policies and principles for which he nobly, courageously, determinedly stood. He is not gone. He shall be a silent adviser in our future councils. His wishes . . . shall govern our acts. His ideals, his policies, his principles, are engraven on our hearts. He is not gone. As years go by, he shall be with us more and more. Every day, beside the official in his office, beside the mule driver on his wagon, beside the clerk at his desk, beside the laborer at his daily task, beside us all,

skilled and unskilled, white and black, there shall be a silent presence—our memory of John J. Eagan. We thank God for the privilege of having known him and having walked a little way with him. In his memory, we pledge our lives to carrying on the work he gave us to do."

In the light of such a life, which seems the higher motive in industry, private profit or public service? Which is the motive that predominates to-day? The good news that Jesus came into Galilee preaching was not a gospel of mammon but of God. He calls men to become servants of their fellows and to seek the redemption of society through sacrificial service. We may repudiate his teaching by a frankly selfish paganism, but if a man professes to be his follower is he not bound to organize his life around service instead of profit as did John J. Eagan?

3. The Method of Industry.—Should the method of industry be that of *laissez-faire,* of merciless competition, every man for himself and the devil take the hindermost? Or should it be that of growing coöperation? We do not of

course maintain that all competition is wrong. It may be either good or bad.[1]

When competition implies the gain of one at the loss of another, when it means to get and to keep any good to the exclusion of others, when it involves selfish monopoly, it often results in waste, cruelty, immoral practices and destruction. When, however, competition is rivalry in well-doing, when it is a contest in service, an effort to excel or surpass in order to coöperate with society, it may make for social progress. Some competition there will probably always be of necessity, but is not the whole upward trend of evolutionary life from a ruthless competitive, to a beneficial coöperative, basis? There is much unfair competition to-day in business that takes the form of monopoly, violence, deceit, predatory methods, the crippling of competitors, selling below cost, local price cutting, etc.

---

[1] As the basis of classical economics Adam Smith maintained that competition was "the life of trade." Selfishness was supposed to work inevitably for the social good, and natural harmony would be secured by all men working for their own interests. But if all life is based upon this single primitive law, as in the theory of Prussian militarism, it turns society into a jungle, red in tooth and claw, and finally into a slaughter-house.

But will coöperation work in practical business to-day? There are many who believe in paternal "welfare" work; and that it pays to provide good conditions and reasonable wages for labor, who yet do not believe that men really can be trusted or that coöperation will work. As an illustration of the possibilities of the method of coöperation we may recall the case of William P. Hapgood of Indianapolis.

Space forbids a description of many other successful illustrations of coöperation. There is the familiar instance of the Coöperative Movement begun in Rochdale, England. In 1844, in the mutual endeavor to escape debt and penury, twenty-eight humble weavers of Rochdale each invested one pound, taking turns in managing their little store. To-day, instead of twenty-eight men, over four million families embracing more than fifteen million persons, or a quarter of the population of Great Britain, are enrolled in more than fifteen hundred Coöperative Societies with annual sales of over a billion dollars, and a bank turnover of more than two billions, or an amount greater than the annual budget of the

American government up to the outbreak of war. These humble toilers by mutual coöperation have not only escaped debt, but now own their own coal mines in Britain, their wheatlands in Canada, their tea and sugar plantations in India, their factories for the making of clothing, shoes, and furniture, their fishing fleets and dairy farms. They have vindicated the practical application of the principle of coöperation.[1]

4. The Spirit of Industry.—Is it possible to elevate the spirit of industry from the rule of gold, or the paternalistic domination of the money power in the interests of the material factors in industry, to the golden rule, in the interest of the human factors? No thoughtful person can deny that money may gain a tremendous power over human life and that it may be used for the almost exclusive profit of the few against the welfare of the many. There is an increasing number in industry who offer evidence that the golden rule can be applied to in-

[1] For a description of the Coöperative Movement in America see "Coöperative Democracy," by J. P. Warbasse.

dustry and business as well as to any other department of life, and that in no place is it more needed.

As illustrative of the possible application of the golden rule in industry, we may take the well-known case of Arthur Nash of Cincinnati. In June, 1916, the A. Nash Company was organized with a capital of $60,000. After the war Mr. Nash bought out a small tailoring sweat-shop employing twenty-nine workers. Some of the women were receiving wages as low as $4.00 a week; the highest paid woman was drawing only $7.00; skilled men were getting $18.00 a week.

Mr. Nash had declared that the war was the final proof that Christianity had failed. In undertaking to prove this from the New Testament, he became convinced that it had never been really tried in industry and society. He resolved honestly to try it in his business by the application of the golden rule. Although fearing that he would fail and facing a loss of $4,000 in his business at the time, Mr. Nash increased the wage scales from fifty to three hundred per cent.

Five times he later increased wages, until he finally handed over to the workers $600,000 in stock dividends, or half the profits up to that date. Instead of failing, production from the first raise in wages began to increase and the business to develop by leaps and bounds.

In less than a decade the business increased from $132,000 in 1919 to nearly $14,000,000 in 1927; the capital from $60,000 to $3,000,000; the number of workers from 29 to over 6,000, including the sales force. In the further application of the golden rule, he and his fellow workers are now giving a quarter of a million dollars to develop an indigenous work among the youth of Turkey.

Even though Mr. Nash was trying to do right by his own employees, however, he was not satisfied. He saw, particularly in the underpaid clothing industry, the workers being sweated and exploited by some ruthless employers in their own selfish interests, under the guise of the "open shop" movement and the so-called "American plan." His own concern was being pointed to as a successful example of the open shop.

Mr. Nash therefore had conferences with Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. He finally called his workers together and asked them to face squarely whether they were to be held up as "an example of an open shop and as an argument why avaricious organizations of capital should be allowed to exploit their laborers and grind their dollars out of the very sweat and blood of our brothers and sisters in their factories," or whether they were to join "whole-heartedly and unreservedly with this great group of fearless organized workers who are laboring to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free and to break their heavy yoke."

After reaching full agreement with the labor union, Mr. Nash says that the firm wholeheartedly turned over all the problems of its workers to organized labor and entered enthusiastically into a coöperative movement for the good, not only of their own workers, but of the toiling masses everywhere. Mr. Nash was no more anxious to apply the golden rule than were

Sidney Hillman and the trade union. Mr. Hillman wrote: "The work of the organized labor movement as the Amalgamated sees it, is to bring the precepts of the Golden Rule into the daily working lives of the masses of men and women. I believe that our conferences have shown us the way of jointly achieving this goal."

Mr. Nash and the labor union now began to see what labor and capital could do working in genuine coöperation. Mr. Nash has a genius for salesmanship. The Amalgamated workers are now doing everything in their power to augment the influence of Arthur Nash and to increase production and efficiency. The effect of the union's insistence on sound technique is already observable from the greater efficiency of the workers right up to the president's office. The union has settled grievances among the workers, eliminated waste, improved quality, increased skill and justified maximum wages. For instance, one of the Nash subsidiaries had been losing money. The union called in its ablest technicians from New York and Chicago to coöperate with the management. Within a year

that subsidiary had climbed "out of the red." Mr. Nash testifies that production has increased both in quantity and quality and complaints from customers for careless workmanship have almost ceased.

5. The Conduct of Industry.—Should the conduct of industry be autocratic or democratic? Should its policies be wholly determined by the small owning group in its own interests, paternalistically giving to labor such wages and conditions as it sees fit, or should labor have a voice in determining its own working conditions? It is true, as we have already pointed out, that some labor leaders have abused their rights and privileges. There doubtless always will be such men both in the ranks of capital and of labor. They make our inquiry only the more necessary.

History shows that the authority of every ruling class has always been based on the ownership of some essential of livelihood. At one period, under the institution of slavery, one class was able to exploit the other because it owned the body of the worker. Later, under serfdom, the

owning class possessed the land upon which the serf must live. To-day under capitalism, the possessing class, by its control of the means of production, the tools, the machines, the factories, practically owns the jobs of the dependent class.[1]

Let us take the ten typical billion-dollar corporations employing or controlling several million workers. Under modern industrial technique, there is a surplus of labor, a mass of unskilled and unemployed workers, eagerly competing with one another for a livelihood. Let us picture for a moment the two classes. The owning class, small, compact, efficient, possessing the wealth, the monopoly of credit, the ownership of the means of production, the control of the jobs of the workers; possessing education and intelligence, commanding the best legal counsel that the country affords, with enormous political and legal influence; owning the press, often holding the dominant influence over education and or-

[1] Professor Thomas Nelson Carver of Harvard says: "The finer things of life—art, literature, science—all have been the products of a vicious system of slavery, of peonage, of the exploitation of human labor. A few favorites of fortune were able to cultivate learning and beauty because they could shift the burdens of existence upon other shoulders."

ganized religion; often owning the land, sometimes even the very homes of the workers; controlling, if desired, a spy system which can furnish all necessary information, and at times misinformation, concerning the workers—here on the one hand is a class possessing almost incalculable power.

Now let us put ourselves in the place of an unemployed man of the working class who is seeking work. If he were intelligent, he might say, "I belong to the vast majority who own no home, no tools, no land, no secure means of livelihood. I have no higher education and no chance of getting such an education for my children. I have no reserve or surplus savings, and not one cent of credit to go upon. There is, we are told, 'plenty of money' for those who own practically everything and can have all the credit they want. But for me there is nothing. I am 'free' to cast my vote politically for men and issues that do not concern me, nor represent my needs. I have no voice nor effective influence in the government, the press, the school, the community, nor in industry. When out of work a

haunting fear drives me from factory to factory in search of work. I am told by employers' associations that I should have the right to work when and where and as I please, under 'freedom of contract.' But what freedom have I, save to get work on any terms that may be offered, or starve?"

Suppose that this worker comes up to the door of a mill belonging to the first of these ten billion dollar corporations. It has assets of two and a half billion dollars. During the last twenty-five years it has earned net profits of $2,345,000,000; distributed cash dividends of $1,340,000,000. It has earned on its preferred stock 180 per cent and on the common stock, which confessedly originally represented nothing but "water," 131 per cent. It has just paid a special share dividend to its absentee stockholders of 40 per cent, holding still an undivided surplus of $553,000,000.[1] Yet one-third of all its employees, or some 85,000 workers, receive less than $1,200, if they work the whole year. For long years this vast

[1] See "The World Tomorrow," May, 1927, p. 198.

corporation was able to work a considerable proportion of its employees a twelve-hour day, and a seven-day week, and has successfully prevented all the efforts of its 200,000 workers to organize to improve their conditions. And yet how else can they improve them? Helpless, dependent or out of work, what freedom, what equal rights, what chance have they? Is it any wonder that the great mass of these workers do not come to our churches, nor believe in our religion? Why should they? What have we done for them? Have we given them social justice?

Is not this the feeling of millions of the dumb, inarticulate mass? In a word, does not the least measure of democracy in industry imply the right of collective bargaining? By collective bargaining we mean the right of labor to organize for its own protection and welfare and to choose its own representatives for industrial conferences without restriction. This implies the right to organize labor unions whose representatives shall be recognized by employers.

Let us ask, if social justice or Christian principles are to have any place in industry and busi-

ness, does not the liberty of the individual for full development exclude the autocratic control of one person by another? Under the principle of liberty, have not all workers, employers and employed alike, the right to choose their own representatives for industrial conference? Or, should the majority be compelled—uneducated and inadequately represented—to be subject to the autocratic control of a minority which exercises the right of collective organization, possessing an overwhelming financial, legal, political, and commercial concentration of power, which it denies to the majority?

The battle for collective bargaining and the right of trade unions to official representatives of their own choosing was finally won in Great Britain after nearly three centuries of struggle. It is a recognized right over most of the continent of Europe. In Germany, for instance, the workers are legally protected by democratically elected shop committees which are required in every factory. The right of collective bargaining by trade unions has been recognized by successive presidents of the United States, including

Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft,[1] and President Wilson's Second Industrial Conference. The principle is upheld by Charles E. Hughes,[2] Herbert Hoover,[3] and a long list of political and industrial leaders in America.

The right of collective bargaining has been asserted and endorsed by the Federal Council of Churches,[4] and by most of the leading Protestant, Catholic and Jewish religious bodies. A review of forty-two social "creeds" of the churches, representing seventeen different denominations,

---

[1] "The principle of combination among workingmen is indispensable to their welfare and their protection against the tyranny of employers." Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, January 22, 1921, p. 8.

[2] "I trust there will be no more struggles in futile opposition to the right of collective bargaining on the part of employees." Quoted in "The Trade Union as the Basis for Collective Bargaining," presented by W. Jett Lauck before the United States Anthracite Coal Commission, 1920, p. 13.

[3] "In the question of industrial conflict resulting in lockout and strike, one mitigating measure has been agreed upon in principle by all sections of the community. That is collective bargaining, by which, wherever possible, the parties should settle their difficulties before they start a fight. It is founded not only on the sense of prevention but of the human right to consolidate the worker in a proper balanced position to uphold his rights against the consolidation of capital." Quoted in the "American Federationist," Jan., 1921, p. 38.

[4] "An ordered and constructive democracy in industry is as necessary as political democracy and collective bargaining and the sharing of shop control and management are inevitable steps in its attainment . . . the right of employees and employers alike to organize; and for adequate means of conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes." "Social Ideals of the Churches," XII.

shows that "virtually all of the creeds commend trade unionism, or, as it is most commonly called, collective bargaining."[1]

In the light of this brief survey is it too much to say that there is need, not only to evangelize Africa and Asia, but to humanize and Christianize industry and business, and that this need is for us even more immediate and imperative? Should not business be lifted to the high standard of a profession? In this connection we would do well to remember Huxley's definition of a professional man, not as a mere profit maker, but as "one who applies science and education to meeting the wants of man."

May we then ask, if the principles of social justice and of Christian ethics are to be applied to industry and business, would they not involve the following results: that the final *purpose* of industry or business is not primarily the making of money, but the making of men; that the dominant *motive* in industry should be, not profit but service; that the *method* prevailing in industry

[1] "Social Creeds of the Churches, a Comparative Study," by Abraham Cronbach.

should be, not unregulated competition, but growing coöperation; that the *spirit* of industry should be dominated not by the rule of gold but by the golden rule; and finally that the *conduct* of industry should be, not a paternalistic autocracy but a developing democracy in growing coöperation for the mutual benefit of all?

II. RACIAL PROBLEMS

We have previously stated that to follow Jesus' way of life, or to apply the principles of love, of humanity and of justice would mean for us: *"To practice brotherhood toward all. To remember that every human being is a person of infinite worth, deserving the fullest opportunity for self-development. To participate in no secret order or fraternity if it tends to exclusiveness, prejudice or strife. To seek justice for every man without distinction of caste or color."*

In the light of these ideals what is our actual practice in the matter of race relations? There are some 710 million members of the white race and 1,040 million of the colored races. The white race is increasing so much faster than the others that before 1950, at the present rate of increase, it will outnumber all other races combined. While the older countries of Asia are almost stationary in population, the white race by its polit-

ical control of nine-tenths of the habitable globe, and of the bulk of the world's food supply, is rapidly outgrowing all others. It occupies the best portions of the earth; it exercises control over more than half of Asia and all but one-thirtieth of the continent of Africa.[1]

Looking at the world as a whole, we do not find that the feeling of race and color prejudice exists to any appreciable extent among the Slavic or Latin peoples. Like an infection it has spread chiefly among the English-speaking peoples, due probably to the political and economical position they occupy in the world. Nowhere is this feeling more intense than in the United States, where the "Nordic" element, having come first into possession of the natural resources, has de-

---

[1] "Encyclopedia Britannica," Vol. I, p. 351, Vol. II, p. 741. The relative numerical strength of the various races is approximately as follows: white race 710 million, yellow 510 million, brown 420 million, black 110 million, making a total of some 1,750 million. In the United States, according to the last census, the 94,820,000 of the white population, constantly added to by immigration, are increasing at the rate of 16 per cent a decade, while the 10,463,000 Negroes are increasing at the rate of only 6.5 per cent. In 1790, 19.3 per cent of our population was colored; to-day it is only 9.9 per cent; and the percentage is steadily decreasing. Abstract of the Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920. E. M. East, "Mankind at the Crossroads," pp. 104-125.

veloped a defensive attitude toward other racial groups.

An impartial examination of the situation would seem to indicate the present *fact* that men are unequal, within one race as well as between different races. Our faith is in the *truth* of the infinite spiritual worth of every man. Because of that worth, every man of every race has a rightful claim to full justice in opportunity.[1]

The basic principle of segregation still holds sway in the South where there is practically complete separation in railways, hotels, schools, and places of entertainment and residence. Although guaranteed the right to vote by the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the great majority of Negroes of voting age in the South are not registered and qualified

[1] We here do not advocate nor do we raise the question of intermarriage. With social conditions as they are, assuming that happiness is an aim in marriage and that marriage is at best most difficult, it would seem that marriage across racial lines is inadvisable. Where two individuals marry from two communities widely separated in custom, in culture, in tradition, or in prejudice, if the two individuals not only, but their children after them, will be handicapped or ostracized or placed under grave disability, then such a marriage is likely to be unhappy and therefore unwise.

as voters, while the illiterate white vote is protected.

Race segregation is growing also in the cities of the North. Detroit is typical of other cities. According to the "Report of the Mayor's Committee on Race Relations" under the chairmanship of Reinhold Niebuhr, the colored population of that city has grown since the war from 10,000 to 80,000. The Negro is frequently paid less for doing the same work as the white man, yet he is charged more for renting the same house. He is rarely admitted to the better paying employments, however well qualified. Because of disregard for the Negro's welfare, his quarters in the big city often become congested slums, a menace alike to the health and morality of both communities.

This situation is aggravated where the Negro also receives less education and is permitted to live in squalor and ignorance, which are the breeders of vice and crime. It also endangers the public peace. The inevitable necessity for expansion in a population that has suddenly multiplied eight-fold, and the natural desire of

every self-respecting man to enter an environment more favorable for the health, morals and education of his children, leads to migration and a series of clashes between the races. An acute housing problem arises and race prejudice accentuates the fear that there will be a loss in real estate values if the Negroes move into any section. The Detroit Committee reports, however, that its "survey shows conclusively that in many instances where the colored population filtered into the white residential sections, making them ultimately colored sections, there was no loss of real estate value and in many cases the rentals and sale prices increased."[1]

If, in any section of the country, the greater proportion of appropriations for education and the best facilities are given to the ruling race, and the worst conditions to the subject race, what moral conditions will it inevitably beget and who is chiefly responsible for them? Lynching has become a national disgrace in America. Since 1885 a total of more than 4,250 persons have

[1] "Report of Mayor's Committee on Race Relations," Detroit, p. 4.

been lynched in the United States, of whom over 3,200 were Negroes. This was an average of two per week for over forty years. The number of lynchings has been declining in recent years; in 1925 the number was 17, in 1926 it rose to 31, a little more than one every two weeks. In many sections the majority who constitute the lynching mob are professing "Christian" church members who see no contradiction between this practice and their religion. Is the solution for this or any problem to be found in the use of violence and the appeal to fear? The answer will depend upon whether our position is to be Christian or frankly pagan.

Mr. Oldham maintains that from the Christian view of God certain consequences in regard to the relation of man with man inevitably follow: The Christian's business is to seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness. God's love for all men gives to each human personality an inestimable worth. Since God loves men and seeks their good, Christians are dedicated to the service of their fellow men. Their religion demands from all that they should sacrifice a por-

NEGRO PROGRESS 1866–1926

Figures taken from Negro Year Book for 1925–26

	1866	1926	Gain in sixty years
Economic Progress			
Homes Owned	12,000	700,000	688,000
Farms Operated	20,000	1,000,000	980,000
Businesses Conducted	2,100	70,000	67,900
Wealth Accumulated	$20,000,000	$2,000,000,000	$1,980,000,000
Educational Progress			
Per Cent Literate	10	90	80
Colleges, Normal Schools	15	500	485
Students in Public Schools	100,000	2,150,000	2,050,000
Teachers in All Schools	600	48,000	47,400
Property for Higher Education	$60,000	$40,000,000	$39,940,000
Annual Expenditures for Education	$700,000	$37,000,000	$36,300,000
Raised by Negroes	$80,000	$3,000,000	$2,920,000
Religious Progress			
Number of Churches	700	47,000	46,300
Communicants	600,000	5,000,000	4,400,000
Sunday Schools	1,000	46,000	45,000
Sunday School Pupils	50,000	3,000,000	2,950,000
Value Church Property	$1,500,000	$100,000,000	$98,500,000

tion of their own lives for others. Since the race problem is dealt with so fully and so fairly in Mr. Oldham's pamphlet in this series, we shall not attempt here to enlarge upon it.[1] Let us only ask ourselves whether individually we are prepared to recognize and to endeavor to root out any race prejudice that still lurks within each of us.

Despite the terrific handicaps and injustice to which the Negro has been subjected at our hands, the preceding table testifies to his remarkable economic, educational and religious progress.

---

[1] "Christianity and the Race Problem," by J. H. Oldham, pp. 16, 17. Price, 15 cents, Pamphlet Department, Room 505, 347 Madison Avenue, New York.

III. INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

"To make peace where there is strife; to seek to outlaw war, 'the world's chief collective sin,' as piracy and slavery have already been outlawed, substituting a positive program of international justice and good will."

Each nation tends to think of itself as pacific in intention and solely defensive in its military policy. No country has been more honest in its motives or more vehement in its protestations of peace than the United States. Yet in the 131 years from 1789 to 1920, the United States Government, out of a total of $66,000,000,000 spent $53,000,000,000, or 78 per cent, for wars and the military establishment.[1] Even our conservative Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon, estimates that we are now spending some eighty per cent of our national budget for wars, past or future,

[1] "Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury." Government Printing Office, 1921. Quoted by Stuart Chase, "The Tragedy of Waste," p. 60.

including interest on war debts, pensions, etc., together with what we spend on preparedness. President Coolidge, in his last message to Congress, said that "our entire permanent and reserve land and sea force, trained and training, consists of about 610,000, and our annual appropriations are about $680,000,000 a year."[1]

While we are rapidly increasing the number of our reserve officers, France has reduced her army by 200,000 below the 1913 total, and her military budget by $90,000,000, or about 20 per cent. A campaign has been conducted not only to extend military training, but *compulsory* military training, in our colleges and universities and even in many high schools, through the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.[2]

---

[1] This represents the gross expenditure of Army, Navy and Air Force and includes non-military expenditures totaling about 100 million. In his statement made in connection with calling the three-power naval disarmament conference at Geneva, the President said: "The American Government and people are convinced that competitive armaments constitute one of the most dangerous and contributing causes of international suspicion and discord, and are calculated eventually to lead to war."

[2] The number of institutions in this country giving courses in military training has been increased since 1912 from 96 to 225. The enrollment of students in these courses has increased from 29,402 to 120,000, or by 400 per cent. In 83 colleges and universities military training is compulsory for two years for some 52,000 students. Some 7,000 boys in high school are compelled to take

No country on earth is so safe and secure as the United States. We possess by far the largest wealth, raw materials, man-power, agricultural and industrial resources combined of any nation on earth. For ramparts we are surrounded by the two great oceans of the world. We have no strong, unfriendly neighbor upon our border, nor any potential enemy within three thousand miles. We are the safest nation in the world.

Among all the nations the British Empire alone, occupying one-quarter of the globe, spends more for armaments and preparedness than we do, approximately $864,000,000. These two great Anglo-Saxon nations together are now spending more annually on their army, navy and air forces than all of Europe, Asia and South America combined. In fact we are spending nearly half of the total of the whole world's expenditure in preparation for war.

Why should not the individual repudiate war,

military training. The Government is spending over $10,000,000 a year on these units. Since 1914 Citizens' Military Training Camps have increased from 4 to 40, or tenfold, with more than 33,000 persons enrolled, all expenses paid by the Government. According to General Hines, this country already has some 50 per cent more officers in its regular and reserve force than it had in war time in its whole expeditionary force.

the Church excommunicate war, the nations outlaw war?[1] Unfortunately, and strange as it may seem, it is chiefly the *"Christian"* nations that are, in the familiar words of General Pershing, "striding up and down the earth armed to the teeth." How many individual Christians approve of this policy or accept it as inevitable? How many of us, on the other hand, would agree with the pronouncement of the Federal Council of Churches and say: war is "the world's chief collective sin. We are convinced that the whole war system of the nations is unnecessary and unchristian"?

Were we not so accustomed to war, as once our forefathers were to slavery, we might see the folly, the futility and contradiction of trying to live our lives in water-tight compartments, half pagan, and half Christian; at one time believing in the sacredness and the protection of human life, and at another preparing for its fierce destruction by poison gas and nameless horrors. "Human life is held sacred, as a general Chris-

[1] See "The Outlawry of War," by C. C. Morrison, "Christian Century," Chicago.

tian principle, until war is declared, when humanity indulges in a universal debauch of bloodshed and barbarism, inventing poison gases and every type of diabolic suggestion to facilitate killing and starvation. Blockades are enforced to weaken and starve civilian populations—women and children. This accomplished, the pendulum of mob passion swings back to the opposite extreme, and the compensating emotions are then unleashed. We begin to hold human life sacred again."[1] Once more we sing our Christmas carols of "peace on earth, good will to men" until the patriotic societies again rouse us to a frenzy of preparedness for the slaughter of the next war. So *this* is Christianity!

What then can the individual do about war to-day? It gives one pause for thought to witness a great state university with five or ten thousand students under the system of compul-

---

[1] M. Sanger, "The Pivot of Civilization," p. 118. John Morley is able to say, in the opening chapter of his volume on Voltaire, that "more blood has been shed for the cause of Christianity than for any other cause whatsoever." And Mr. Lecky states that "with the exception of Mohammedanism, no other religion has done so much to produce war as was done by the religious teachers of Christendom during several centuries."

sory military training, with scarcely a single student who under a regimented system has had the courage to do any independent thinking or to challenge the war system in his own institution. Boston University, with several other colleges, furnishes a typical example of what can be done by one or more courageous students. Henrietta Perkins, the managing editor of the university's humorous weekly, in the same city where Garrison was mobbed, was forced to resign her position because she had published an issue of the college paper ridiculing compulsory military training and the local R. O. T. C. Within two years, however, under a new president compulsory training was abolished.[1]

The writer has fully stated his own position upon these matters in "The Abolition of War."[2]

---

[1] "Briefly summarized the president's reasons were as follows: First, he is a true American and as such is opposed to militarism; second, he believes that preparedness is no guaranty of peace; third, he holds that Boston University was founded 'to promote virtue and piety and learning' and not to train men to fight; fourth, he is a Christian and believes that Christianity is opposed to war and hence to militarism. President Marsh's statement is vigorous and courageous; with more dignity, it is as vigorous and courageous as were the earlier utterances of Henrietta Perkins." "The Nation," p. 520, November 24, 1926.

[2] "The Abolition of War," by Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page, price, 15 cents, will be sent on application, together with another

As the author of "The Right to Fight" and a strong anti-pacifist it took the writer ten long years following 1914 to reach his present position. Speaking for myself, I have come slowly and unwillingly to the conclusion that modern war is wrong. I believe it is wrong in its *methods,* as giving free rein to an irresponsible national sovereignty under a military necessity that knows no law, where might makes right and the moral law is abrogated; in employing untruth and deceptive half-truth as the essential methods of a distorted propaganda; and in the creation of hatred, leading inevitably to retaliation, reprisals and atrocities. I believe it is wrong in its *results* as intrinsically and inevitably destructive—of material wealth, of human life and of moral standards. It seems to be futile and suicidal. Therefore war would seem to me to be unchristian and morally wrong as the utter negation of Jesus' way of life and of the ultimate nature of God himself, as love. I will strive with a large and rapidly increasing number of Christians to

pamphlet of this series, "Christianity and the Race Problem," by J. H. Oldham. Both pamphlets postpaid for 20 cents, The Pamphlet Department, Room 505, 347 Madison Avenue, New York.

lead the Church to excommunicate it, that the state may finally outlaw it and make it as illegal as slavery, the duel, highway robbery or private murder. I will strive with all men of good will for the removal of the causes of war, the creation of an international mind, a growing sense of world brotherhood, and the active support of all agencies that make for peace.

This principle and policy is not defeatist or unpatriotic as regards any one nation. The movement is world-wide. It is steadily and proportionately gaining ground throughout Europe as well as in America. It seeks progressive, proportional disarmament, as nations agree to outlaw war, as they already have outlawed piracy and slavery, substituting instead judicial processes, with arbitration and conciliation, as we have already done in city, state and nation. The movement has assumed larger proportions in some other nations, as in Great Britain, than it has in America.

Each person must decide this question for himself. We ask no man to sign a pledge promising never to engage in war. Could the reader, how-

ever, go so far as seriously to purpose: "To make peace where there is strife; to seek to outlaw war, 'the world's chief collective sin,' as piracy and slavery have already been outlawed, substituting a positive program of international justice and goodwill"?

IV. REDEEMING THE SOCIAL ORDER

Liquor and Law Observance.—There are a number of reforms that might be dealt with but we shall confine ourselves to one or two which affect everyone, beginning with the question of liquor and law observance. Prohibition is a gigantic experiment. Since January of 1920, when it became a federal law, we have had the "prohibition problem" on our hands. In the popular view, chaos seems to reign. The Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council of Churches reports "a falling away . . . from the crusading enthusiasm," and "a counter movement of public opinion." It states further: "The resulting problem is made more difficult by several factors: the strong individualistic tradition in American life; our heterogeneous population, many of whom are by habit and native background rendered hostile and even un-

comprehending toward prohibition of the liquor traffic; the tight grip that the liquor business has long held upon our political life; our dual form of government, federal and state, with its division of functions and responsibilities; and the moral reaction that is a part of our heritage from the war, which accentuates every lawless tendency."[1]

On all sides the clamor is heard that respect for orderly government is dwindling. Politicians play hide-and-seek with the issue. They hide when it is a question of making a forthright statement one way or the other in party platforms. They seek when it is a question of profitable patronage, and so open another door to corruption. Youth is alternately attacked and defended for its attitude toward the Volstead Act. Imposing arrays of statistics are made to bolster the most widely divergent conclusions.

The American people entered upon this experiment because they believed it was necessary if they were to become a sober and temperate nation. Does it now look as if they had decided wisely?

[1] "The Prohibition Situation," Sept., 1925.

Many of the most significant results of the prohibition experiment cannot be measured by statistics. No figures, for example, can tell the true story of how much the passing of the saloon has meant to wives and children of the working class. Mrs. Martha Bensley Bruère in "Does Prohibition Work?" recently published under the auspices of the National Federation of Social Workers, says in her conclusion, after frankly facing facts on both sides, that "the reports do show that all the things hoped for by the advocates of prohibition are being realized in some places, and that even where the law is least observed some of them have come true." Lillian D. Wald of the Henry Street Settlement in New York City seems to voice the prevailing view of those engaged in such work when she says, "The standard of family life has been raised through the prohibition act." Mrs. Bruère's assistant in this research project feels that it is certain that "savings banks deposits have increased in amounts and in the number of depositors to such an extent and in such places as to require more than general prosperity and higher wages as an

explanation."[1] Drunkenness seems to have been enormously reduced and now to be held in check. Even New York City apparently reveals a record of significant improvement in convictions for drunkenness, among both first offenders and repeaters. In 1914, 24 first offenders were convicted out of every 10,000 of the population; in 1925, only 6.[2] General crime statistics appear to be an insecure foundation for any conclusion one way or the other on prohibition.

Economically, in addition to the aid in the reduction of poverty suggested in the preceding paragraph, it is necessary to remember some of the industrial wastes which have been eliminated or reduced by prohibition. Monday is no longer a day when many laborers are absent from work because of "hang-overs." The increase in per capita production is perhaps also due in some measure to prohibition.

Professor Irving Fisher of Yale in his "Prohibition at Its Worst" maintains that we are al-

---

[1] "Is Prohibition Being Enforced?" M. S. P. Kellogg, "Current History," October, 1927, pp. 49-54; see also "Prohibition at Its Worst," Irving Fisher, pp. 176-186.

[2] "Prohibition at Its Worst," pp. 20-69, 238.

ready saving six billion dollars a year and the consumption of alcohol in beverage form is less than 16 per cent of prewar figures. The production of labor has been increased by some 10 per cent. He maintains that juvenile delinquency has been reduced by half, and new recruits to drunkenness even more. He holds that it is politically impossible to legalize liquor by another law, but we can nullify law enforcement by disrespect for all law.

What should be the attitude of the earnest citizen in the face of these conflicting results? In the first place, it seems to us that he should remember that the problem is still one of temperance, and temperance education. If alcohol was a poison which before 1920 was physically, mentally and morally dangerous to men and women as individuals and to society as a whole —then it is dangerous to-day. We must once more learn the effects of alcohol; and inaugurate anew a program of education. If prohibition is a bad law, it should be modified or repealed; if it is a good law, it should be observed by good citizens and enforced.

The crucial question is, now that we have a federal prohibition statute, what ought we to do with it? It has had successes and failures; will retaining it be the best way to become quickly and permanently a sober and temperate nation? More time and more whole-hearted enforcement seem to be needed before we can tell. No vast traffic based on an appetite cultivated for thousands of years and powerful in intrenched interests will be dislodged by the half-hearted attempts of a few years, and no large advance will be made so long as many officials, high and low, are only "politically dry."

We must take heart from the history of other great reform attempts. John Marshall was worried in 1833 over the outcome of the United States constitution, forty-six years after it had been ratified. The slave trade was legally prohibited in 1807; but it required until 1871 to stamp it out. We must also lengthen our memories and call to mind once more the evils which attended the liquor traffic before prohibition. The saloon's influence was everywhere, and cor-

ruption of all sorts flourished, for Americans are not a temperate people.

Modification proposals must be studied fairly but critically. Canada's recent experience would perhaps suggest that a system of government control does not eliminate the difficulties, and that the return of light wines and beers does not forestall the demand for hard liquors but rather increases their consumption.[1] But, whatever view we may take, we must end our policy of drift and substitute for it some reasoned, consistent, courageous program.

A list of practical suggestions for a college student interested in this subject might include the following:

1. Unless it offends your highest moral sense, obey the law. Then, share your convictions with your friends; and make persistent efforts to see that organizations with which you are affiliated do not violate it at dances, banquets, etc.

2. Work through your alumni organization to ask old graduates who return for football games,

---

[1] "Current History," Dec., 1926, pp. 322-331; "Where Prohibition Has Been Modified," "Christian Century," April 29, 1926.

etc., not to make their coming an occasion for a campus carousal.

3. Try to spur the college administration and the local authorities to move against the sources of campus liquor.

4. Read and otherwise investigate along such lines as the following: alcohol and its effects, individually and socially; the results of prohibition; reasons for the partial ineffectiveness of prohibition; alternatives to the present system, etc.

5. Stimulate campus discussion and collective action along those lines by securing speakers for mass meetings, forming discussion groups, proposing editorials for the college newspaper, suggesting reading material, etc.

Sex Problems

We are all confronted with this central and intricate problem of sex. Of all the questions of social justice none is so delicate and difficult, probably none strikes so deep into the heart of human happiness and misery, none is so steeped

in ignorance and blindness, as is this problem of sex. Not all of us are personally concerned with the problems of industry, race or war. But this is everyone's definite problem; it is associated with our profoundest emotions; here is where we live. Our prejudice in this field is supported by the most ancient authority and reinforced by patterns that seem built into our nervous systems. Concerning the other problems of social justice many of us are comfortable, impartial observers on the side-lines. Here we are all in the game. And it is not just a game. Here all of us have suffered together. Yet here where we most need sympathetic understanding and mutual help we have it least. Indeed, hovering over this subject, there seems to be a taboo of silence, of ignorance and of misinformation. So serious is the situation that it is perhaps not too much to say that more women and men, more in the ranks of youth and of age, are suffering in this sphere than from all economic causes combined, such as poverty, unemployment, bad housing, etc.; more persons are being victimized than because of race

prejudice, for it affects all races; and more casualties result from the conflicts of sex than resulted from all the battles of the world war. How few persons there are who in these matters are thoroughly informed, harmoniously masters of themselves, and radiantly happy in their sex life and relations, whether they be single or married!

At the dynamic center of man's life there are two major drives, two dominant instinctive tendencies—hunger and love. For weal or woe these rule the world. On the one hand, there is the struggle for life, for self-preservation, self-expression, self-realization. And on the other hand, there is the struggle for the life of others, for social realization, for the fulfillment of one's isolated, fractional, lonely life in the completion of love. Love demands the sharing of life, if possible, with one member of the opposite sex, and then in the ever-widening circles of human affection and sympathy, in the home, the social group, the commonwealth and finally, ideally, with all humanity. But "love is the link of the perfect

life."[1] It is the link that binds man alike to the infinite and to his fellow man.

"For life with all it yields of joy and woe
And hope and fear . . .
Is just our chance o' the prize of learning love."

As the fragrant rose springs from its roots in the earth, so love—the greatest, highest, holiest, most glorious thing in life, because it *is* life realized—springs from the physical root of sex. Man's life is not, as ascetically conceived, lived in two separate, water-tight compartments; one the lower life of the flesh and the other the higher life of the spirit. It is rather one embodied and incarnate life with two aspects, physical and spiritual. To neglect or despise either is to emasculate life.

Man has been prone to make of sex a thing secret, or hidden, or unclean, to be despised or mortified. But if life is anywhere of divine origin it must be in its source and in the fulfillment of its end. In the sane and healthy open-

[1] Colossians 3:14. Moffatt's Translation.

ing chapter of Genesis we read: "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. . . . And God saw everything that he had made and behold it was very good."[1]

From the healthy basis of sex, which permeates all the life of the body, and when developed into its higher spiritual possibilities, all the life of the soul as well, there spring love and the whole impulse of creativity; manhood and womanhood; fatherhood and motherhood; the family and the home; our conception of God as Father and man as brother; parental care and the highest mystical spiritual union; sacrifice and service; chivalry and courage; the love of beauty and of art; and many of the highest and holiest developments in morality and religion.

From this, perhaps the strongest dynamic and drive in all life, there may spring man's highest inspiration but also his greatest menace. From this same root of sex-love there may grow lust or selfish gratification, the violation of personality,

[1] Genesis 1:27, 31.

the prostitution of womanhood, the debasement and enslavement of manhood, jealousy, hatred, and the deepest depths of vice and crime to which humanity may sink. The tragedies of life, the literatures of the world, the scriptures of all nations are stained with the record of man's undoing through ignorance or perversion of this powerful instinct. Thus Emerson says: "The preservation of the species was a point of such necessity that Nature has secured it at all hazards by *immensely overloading the passions,* at the risk of perpetual crime and disorder." And Malthus said: "The passion between the sexes is necessary, and will remain nearly in its present state." It behooves us then to heed whether this mighty driving force shall become our ally or our enemy. Yet strange to say, just at this point of humanity's deepest need and gravest danger we have left it in its most helpless ignorance.

One of the first needs is a frank facing of the facts regarding the sex life, yet confessedly in this area facts are difficult to obtain and statistics are often unreliable. Let us endeavor, how-

ever, candidly to review the present situation in this country.

We find marriage postponed or made impossible for many, and a large proportion of our youth unmarried during the years of greatest sex tension, subject to the upheavals by which Nature avenges itself.[1] A large proportion of adults are mismated, unhappily married, or so left without guidance that they do not make a success of marriage. We find young and old in almost unbelievable ignorance. Youth is left without proper sex education, and sometimes almost utterly uninstructed upon entering marriage, often unwittingly to wreck it, and to drift toward unhappiness or separation. We find the widespread increase of divorce which has nearly doubled in the last two decades. There is an even larger number for whom the reality of marriage is dead, who would welcome divorce. We are perhaps witnessing the partial breakdown of

[1] We find that of the male population over fifteen years of age, 12,967,565, or 35.1 per cent are unmarried, and 9,616,902, or 27.3 per cent of the female population. Of young men twenty-four years of age, 56.3 per cent are unmarried and 42.3 per cent are married. "Abstract of Fourteenth Census," 1920.

marriage in the present disintegration of the home. As one symptom and by-product of the evils of our present system there is widespread prostitution involving the sacrifice of over 200,000 unfortunate women. A much larger number are living in irregular relations outside the pale of legal marriage. There is a wide extension of venereal disease, largely as a result of sex promiscuity. It is estimated that annually over half a million abortions are being illegally performed in the United States.[1] Despite its outward appearances of respectability, our country is at present in a transitional period, vainly combining in unstable equilibrium an ascetic, repressive, reactionary puritanism, with a frank paganism which repudiates these puritan standards.

Youth, after the war which was followed by the breakdown or challenge of many of the old conventional moral standards, is confronted by sex problems today as no other rising generation ever was. Outside the churches youth is widely

[1] Prof. J. W. Williams of Johns Hopkins University estimates the number at half a million annually, while Max Hirsch places it as high as two million. E. M. East, "Mankind at the Crossroads," p. 262.

in revolt against the conventional puritan standards which age has imposed, and is candidly experimenting. At this critical time our country is burdened with obsolete legislation almost unbelievably backward, oppressive and medieval. We allow criminals, idiots and feeble-minded to produce the prolific breed of their kind, while forbidding to the mass of the population, especially to millions of working women, many of whom are in dire physical need, the simplest, most elementary knowledge of birth limitation. Our state enactments upon these matters are in a chaos of self-contradiction. Almost no two states are agreed; what is legal in one is null and void in another; no divorce is granted in one while the widest latitude is allowed in another.

Our moral codes are in almost as great confusion as our state legislation concerning sex relations. The masses are unconsciously in transition from a once unchallenged authority to an autonomous, rational standard of morality which they have not yet achieved. Conditions of a bygone age and the *mores* or customs of an older generation have imposed upon society the out-

ward framework of a conventionally respectable morality. But it is little realized what widespread contradiction, unreality, hypocrisy and misery are covered by this system, which sanctions almost anything up to commercialized prostitution if only it outwardly conforms to the conventionalities of legal marriage, while it denies self-realization and normal physical life to millions victimized by the present system. Religion might have furnished the sorely needed light, inspiration and dynamic drive to realize life more abundantly in all these relations. But it has been at times blinded by professionalism and ecclesiasticism, or hardened out of sympathy by traditional asceticism in matters of sex. Instead of proving to be a Good Samaritan to sexually suffering humanity, it is, like the priest and Levite of old, passing by on the other side of these sex problems. Apart from its censorious warnings to youth, which is misunderstood to-day in the church as it is in the home, religion is for the most part silent on the crucial subject of sex.

Let us examine some of these problems that

confront men and women to-day, especially in the ranks of youth.

Sex education has been seriously neglected in most homes. At an early age questions concerning the origins of life naturally arise in every healthy child's mind, and the child habitually turns to the parent for answer. If these questions are evaded or angrily repulsed, that which should have been a healthy, happy and normal development may now begin to become something secret or immodest, unnatural, repressed, or morbid. The most important and dangerous questions in the life of youth are often left for answer to bad boys—or girls.[1] If parents, teachers and pastors neglect this task, misguided boys and girls do not. Information that should have been given healthily in the home, and that might have proved a bond of sympathy and understanding between parent and child, may

[1] Dr. Exner of the American Social Hygiene Association, in his "Problems and Principles of Sex Education" in an analysis compiled from answers to 948 questionnaires, shows that of the first permanent impressions concerning sex 91.5 per cent were from unwholesome sources. Of the men questioned only 4 per cent had received their information from parents and 80.4 per cent had been left to receive it from other boys. The effects reported were for 8.8 per cent good, for 79 per cent they were bad.

now be given, not in the atmosphere of the home or school, but of the back alley. The best authorities are now agreed that when questions are asked they should always be truthfully answered, and information concerning sex should be treated normally and naturally as a part of the whole of life.

Dr. Bernard Bauer maintains that ignorance concerning sex matters is responsible for most unhappy marriages. Yet, ignorance is something that can be corrected if we will. It is significant that Dr. Katherine B. Davis, in her study of the sex life of 1,000 intelligent and socially successful American women, found that 87 per cent considered their marriage happy. Further, there was a definitely larger proportion of happy marriages among those who had been instructed beforehand. A growing body of literature is available on these subjects.[1]

---

[1] There is need of a wise and fearless textbook on sex life and marriage. Havelock Ellis' classic, "Little Essays on Love and Virtue," is concerned only with principles. Herbert Gray's "Men, Women and God" is admirable, but hardly goes far enough. I know of no complete and detailed volume on sex life to which one would be willing to give endorsement without strongly expressed qualifications. Maude Royden's "Sex and Common Sense" has an exalted and modern point of view, except for some restrictions concerning birth control. Popenoe's "Modern Marriage" is commendable in general, but the author condemns contraception.

Concerning marriage and divorce Paul Popenoe says: "That something is wrong with marriage is universally admitted and deplored. The number of celibates, of mismated couples, of divorces, of childless homes, of wife-deserters, of mental and nervous wrecks; the frequency of marital discord, or prostitution and adultery, of perversions, of juvenile delinquency, tell the story."[1]

[1] Popenoe, "Modern Marriage," p. vi.

On the other hand, Mrs. Marie Stopes, in "Married Love" and "Wise Parenthood," and Mrs. Margaret Sanger, in "Happiness in Marriage," with valuable instructions and forceful writing, extol birth control beyond measure, the former being largely concerned with praise of one method, the latter urging a wait till the third year for the arrival of the first child. Nevertheless, failure in marriage could be prevented for many if young women would read Margaret Sanger's "Happiness in Marriage" and young men Malchow's "Sexual Life." More important for married couples are Dr. W. F. Robie's "Sex and Life" and its revision "The Art of Love," poorly as these books are written. Books like the above may be ordered from The Book Room, 600 West 122nd Street, New York.

All the larger volumes could hold the essentials in one-third of their pages of reiteration. In all of them there are chapters and passages essential to a sound understanding of the technique of love. In each there are sections which will remove inhibitions and save the blunderings of ignorance which have often wrecked marriages that would otherwise have been successful. But all demand large elisions for use by the general public. The right book is yet to be written.

Information regarding the Birth Control Movement may be secured from the American Birth Control League. Two scientific inquiries into the medical aspects of contraception are under way, that of the Committee on Maternal Health, 370 Seventh Avenue, New York, and the recent Birth Control Investigation Committee, 41-b Clanricarde Garden, London, W. 2.

Already the number of divorces granted annually in the United States exceeds 175,000, a number in excess of any other modern nation, not excepting Japan and Russia. Our divorce rate is nearly twice as high as it was twenty years ago and more than four times as high as it was sixty years ago. Of every sixty-nine marriages in the United States ten now end in the divorce court, others in separation, and a larger number in strained relations or unhappiness. The state of Nevada and several of our cities now record some ten divorces for every ten new marriages.[1]

"Love is the emotion which arises when two personalities stimulate, facilitate and reinforce each other—when they function together in progressive integration. But if they thwart each other in physical functioning, in spiritual aspiration, or even in seemingly trivial tastes and wishes, if they hamper, or coerce, or defraud, or enslave one another, then marriage becomes a

[1] E. E. Eubank, "The World Tomorrow," June, 1927, p. 74. The rate of divorce in the United States has been about one-half higher than in Austria, France and Japan, which next to America have the highest divorce rates in the world, and about seventeen times higher than the rate for England.

disaster."[1] If the marriage has become a veritable disaster it may better be remedied or ended. The increase of divorce does not necessarily mean that there are more maladjustments in marriage than there were fifty years ago. The growing spirit of independence, especially among women, makes them unwilling to tolerate such maladjustments. Added to this is the evolution of marriage from an enforced institution imposed by the state or church, to a personal and private relationship.

Where real marriage has finally ended, divorce may be the lesser of two evils. Yet at its best, divorce signifies the failure of marriage, and often the wreck of a home. Bad marriages are the chief source of later divorces. Marriage should be a physical and spiritual union of two free individuals. As it requires the will of both parties to enter it, it will take the good will of both to maintain it. It can rest only on mutuality. If we allow the widest liberty for marriage by mutual consent, we should question whether

[1] Hornell Hart, "Unsuccessful Marriages—Why?" in "The World Tomorrow," June, 1027, p. 261.

marriage should then be made like a prison house or a manacled chain gang from which there can be no possible escape.

The report of the Divorce Commission in England showed that a long and degrading course of concerted lying and humbug, of scandal and publicity to prove immorality in order to gain divorce by the rich who can afford it, has not had a beneficial moral restraint upon the population of that country, compared to the freer atmosphere of Scotland where marriage is dissoluble at the option of either party.[1] Experience has shown that immorality is the inevitable accompaniment of marriage that is fixed and indissoluble.

There are diseases only to be cured by serious operation. There are marriages incurable save by divorce, but only when the disorder would eat like cancer into character. As hazardous surgery

[1] "Report of the Divorce Commission," "Divorce is not a disease, but a remedy for a disease," pp. 37, 95. Divorce by mutual consent was re-established as a principle of the Code Napoleon, which reverted to the earlier practice of Roman Law. It has long obtained in Switzerland and is recognized in a number of European countries. According to the Norwegian Divorce Law, for instance, "separation and divorce is granted by the magistrate on mutual consent."

is sanctioned to prevent death or permanent disability, so divorce is allowable to keep souls from bleeding to death or from chronic pain that disables all faculties. But in either case it goes without saying that lesser measures must have had whole-hearted trial.

There is a curious feature in many current discussions of divorce. It is treated as if it were a single question. One part is simple, one of extreme complexity. If childless, the partnership that is hopelessly bankrupt may dissolve, the mating that would cripple two lives may undo its error. But where children have been born there is the issue of little minds possibly lamed forever, or given distorted vision. Then the parents may part only if the children will suffer less harm from divorce than from continuance of marriage.

Prostitution is recognized as another outstanding evil of our present social order. What is not so generally recognized is that it is an inevitable by-product of some of the evils of our present system. It is a symptom of the deep-seated disease of that system.

Of that highest and holiest sacrament where man enters into the holy of holies of being, in sharing in the very creative activity of God, prostitution is a ghastly perversion. He who uses any woman for his selfish, sensuous satisfaction regardless of her worth or welfare, prostitutes her. Upon a rational basis of morality could one say that that is right which enhances life as a whole? That is wrong which injures life—my own, my neighbor's, or the life of society, present or future. He who defends prostitution as morally justifiable, and regards the prostitute as fair game and his property because he pays for her, could equally, with special pleading, maintain his right to eat her as a cannibal, or hire her to commit murder simply because he had paid for it. Yet this "right" is defended in the "bull sessions" of many college fraternities.

The so-called *"revolt of youth"* probably constitutes the most serious sex problem of our time. What is the nature and cause of this revolt? To begin with, no other rising generation ever followed a world war that resulted in

the destruction of so many established customs and moral standards. No other generation of youth ever had such freedom—and new freedom may be either an emancipating or a devastating thing. No other generation in this country ever faced the insistent demand for equality between the sexes resulting in the new freedom for woman. No other ever had such high-powered playthings placed in its hands as the auto, the radio, the moving picture, together with so much leisure and spending money. No other ever was subjected to the seduction of such commercialized amusements, or such a rapid increase in the circulation of obscene literature and sex periodicals.

All this artificial sex stimulation is "sexciting" human nature abnormally, at the very time of this new freedom. Never has there been publicly so much promiscuous "petting" and "necking," so much toying with passion and playing with the fire of the age-old demand for sex gratification. The pursuit of mere physical stimulation arouses deeper passions than it can satisfy, or than inexperienced youth can control.

Youth thus finds itself caught in the rapids of a gathering torrent and swept swiftly beyond its moral depth.

Added to all this, no other generation ever faced more acutely the conflict between nature and society—nature with its imperious instinct and society with its cold criticism of reason; nature demanding expression and society repression; nature with its world-affirmation and conventional society with its world-denial; nature with its insatiable individual needs and society with its sanctions and penalties; nature with its autonomous freedom and society with its external authority and restraint; nature with its God-implanted demands of body, mind and spirit, and society with its seemingly crushing prohibitions of convention, public opinion, law, morality and religion; nature with its eternal "Thou shalt," and society with its prohibitive "Thou shalt not." How can this conflict and contradiction be resolved when neither nature nor society is absolute, infallible nor final?

Nature, on the one hand, holds vast potency and promise, but unrestrained and unregulated,

the menace of possible evil. By itself it is not informed, disciplined, or enlightened. It is a blind giant, an untamed Samson ready to fight for right or be taken captive by the Delilah of desire. Mighty from the long past of evolution, demanding and impatient in the present, imperative as it surges to its unknown goal in the future, it wields the unrestrained might of the tide, the storm, the earthquake and the volcano. Alone, without the discipline of society, its rank growth yields the jungle, savagery and war.

Society, on the other hand, like nature, has vast promise and possibility even of a new social order, but it also has its dangers, its heartless injustice, its manifold evils. There are its *mores,* its tribal or group customs, faulty, unresponsive to progress, conservative, sometimes reactionary and repressive, external, authoritarian, often cruelly unjust to the individual. There are the vast "danger zones" of the present social order—economic, racial, international, political, moral, sexual, with all the poverty, the slums, the conflicts and wars which they entail. No wonder that youth is tempted to ask if any-

thing could be worse than the seemingly senseless and heartless repressions and injustices of the present order. There are all of the repressions of youth by age, of woman by man, of the poor by the rich, of the darker races by the white race, of right by might, of the present and the future by the dead past, of the majority by the minority, or *vice versa*. Here is society, with all its mocking ideals and utopias, yet with the actualities of its glaring deficiencies and ghastly failures.

How then is this conflict between nature and society to be resolved? Could we say that man should follow his highest nature as far as possible in the self-realization of the individual life, provided it is without damage to the individual or society? He must weigh well and learn what society has to teach from the priceless and costly experience of the past. He may have to allow for his own relative youth, inexperience, ignorance and prejudice, and for the special pleading and specious argument of blind passion with its long wreckage of life.

Having, as far as possible, weighed all the

factors in the problem, subjective and objective, of conscience and tradition, nature and society, he may finally ask what course, that is both natural and social, will best fulfill his *whole* nature as an individual, and his whole duty to society? What will most enhance life as a whole? And on the other hand, what course will injure life, his own, that of his neighbor or society? Nature gives us raw impulse, society rich experience. Neither is infallible. Finally, as an autonomous, free but responsible member or part both of nature and of society, the individual must do what seems to him to be right, all things considered.

The unrestricted increase of population and obsolete legislation regarding it are among the evils that must be remedied. From Plato to Benjamin Franklin notable writers have pointed out the dangers of the unregulated increase of population, especially of the socially unfit.[1] More

[1] Thus Aristotle clearly advocates family limitation: "It is necessary to take care that the increase of the people should not exceed a certain number in order to avoid poverty and its concomitants, sedition and other evils." "Politics," Book VII, Chapter V.

than a century ago, in 1798, Rev. Thomas Malthus wrote his epoch-making essay on "The Principle of Population as It Affects the Future Improvement of Society," in which he showed the tendency of mankind to increase faster than its means of subsistence, and the results of overpopulation in poverty and human misery. His aim was to find and remove these causes of misery.

Even Malthus little dreamed of the rapidity with which his predictions would be fulfilled. In the century since his day the population of the world has increased more than in the ten thousand years of preceding history, and it will double again in less than a century. Professor E. M. East of Harvard in his "Mankind at the Crossroads" shows that in the lifetime of our children or grand-children the world will reach its saturation point where it can sustain no more.

The world's population is increasing by 12,000,000, or 7 per cent every year, annually adding the equivalent of two Belgiums to be fed in our soon-to-be-overcrowded world. As the average man requires two and a half acres of

land to feed him, forty million additional acres each year will be required to sustain our rapidly multiplying humanity.

According to conservative authorities, the present population of 1,750,000,000 can increase only to 5,200,000,000 to arrive at the limit which the earth can sustain. "If the present rate of increase could continue unabated, babies now alive would live to see this event come to pass. The world would be filled with people without faith or hope, a seething mass of discontented humanity struggling for mere existence, within the space of a single life-time."[1] A more alarming fact, however, is, that while the better strains of the population tend to die out, the socially inferior strains are multiplying fastest.

About fifty per cent of college women remain unmarried. Studies of the class lists of Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and other colleges, of "Who's

---

[1] "Mankind at the Crossroads," p. 69. According to Sir George K. Knibbs, statistician of the Australian Commonwealth in his "Mathematical Theory of Population," "the present rate of increase in the world's population . . . doubles the population in 60.15 years, and gives a population 3.16 times as great in 100 years; thus in 200 years the population will have increased 10-fold, and in 400 years 100-fold."

Who in America," etc., show that the worthiest members of society are not replacing themselves. The fertile, degenerate Jukes women frequently cited by sociologists averaged 4.3 children each. In New York the foreign population of two-fifths produces two-thirds of the children. "The public money is now spent largely on the indolent, the pauper, and the criminal." As Herbert Spencer says: "Fostering the good-for-nothing at the expense of the good is an extreme cruelty. It is a deliberate storing up of miseries for future generations. There is no greater curse to posterity than of bequeathing them an increasing population of imbeciles." Yet is this not just what we are doing?

We have at present in the United States between a million and a half and two million defectives. There are between five and six million who cannot properly be committed to institutions yet who have not the intelligence to complete the primary grades in our public schools. The feeble minded number from 300,000 to 500,000, some 80 per cent due to heredity. Of our draft recruits examined in the last war,

25.3 per cent were unable "to read and understand newspapers and write letters home." We have thirty times the proportion of the illiteracy of Germany or the Scandinavian countries. To these we must add from the record of our census the defectives needing institutional care in the United States as follows:[1]

84,198 paupers in almshouses.
136,472 prisoners and juvenile delinquents.
493,934 further commitments during one year.
44,708 deaf and dumb, largely hereditary.
57,272 blind in asylums.
248,560 in insane asylums.
20,731 in feeble-minded institutions.[2]

This does not include those outside of institutions whom Professor East estimates at one-

---

[1] Census of 1910. See also Sixth Annual Report of Birth Statistics, U. S. Census 1920. Families of lawyers and judges average 2.2 living children; doctors 2.1; authors, editors and reporters 2.1; skilled workmen 2.6; janitors and sextons 3.4; mine laborers 3.6; garbage men and scavengers 3.0 living children. A. E. Wiggam in his "New Decalogue of Science," says: "It seems, to put it none too strongly, that America is simply hell-bent on taking a brief biological joy-ride with the definite policy of later turning over its vast intellectual conquests to the morons," p. 314.

[2] "Mankind at the Crossroads," p. 313.

quarter of our population, judged by the proportion of recruits tested for the army, whose minds are rather feeble but less than half of whom could be classed technically as morons.

Now the question is, are we to let our population be controlled by intelligence or by chance? Are we rationally to reduce the unfit and increase the fit; or shall we let these spawning incompetents "increase and multiply," and limit population only by poverty, crime, war, famine and pestilence throughout the earth?

According to J. M. Duncan, the average fertile woman with no knowledge of birth control, if she lets nature take its course, may give birth to some fifteen children in her normal life. Are we to leave the poor in ignorance to bring into the world unwanted children whom they cannot feed or clothe or properly care for? Are we to leave the socially unfit to produce their prolific spawn, or, in the words of Professor East, "teach *all* people to limit their families in accordance with the mother's strength, and with due regard for the fundamental right of every child to receive a healthy start in life and an

opportunity for development?"[1] Upon the intelligence, forethought and direction with which population is limited and improved will depend the health, happiness and often the very life of the mother, the care of the child, the economic welfare of the workers, the culture and progress of the community, the character of the racial stock and the prospect of abolishing from the world such desolating scourges as war. Battalions of children in excess of possibility of maintenance are one prolific cause of war, as of other evils. "Unregulated multiplication eventually thwarts development and happiness."[2]

"Not propagating the race but raising the level of humanity must be the aim of existence." In this connection Holland has proved a striking example in the matter of birth control. Its New Malthusian League gives instruction through laywomen and provides the people with literature. While the birth rate has fallen and population has been intelligently controlled, it has not resulted in "race suicide." The general

[1] "Mankind at the Crossroads," p. 290.
[2] E. A. Ross, "Standing Room Only," Chapter XXII.

death rate and infantile mortality has fallen to the lowest of any country in Europe. Birth control has contributed toward increase in population, race improvement in the general physique and health of the Dutch people, and a raising of moral standards. The number of marriages has increased, the age of marriage has lowered, and divorces are rare. While its neighbor, Belgium, whose church frowns upon birth control, has 84.1 illegitimate children per 1,000, liberal Holland has only 19.1 per 1000.[1] Thus birth control "is an intelligent adaptive response to an environmental force, population pressure."[2]

In the light of these considerations our statutory restrictions on birth control and the intelligent limiting and improvement of population

---

[1] Between 1880 and 1920 the birth rate in Holland fell from 37.6 per 1,000 to 19.3, the death rate fell from 31 to 10.5, infant mortality fell from 27 to 5.7 per 1,000; while the yearly increase in population has arisen from 11.4 to 17.8 per 1,000. Dr. Aletta Jacobs, Sixth International Birth Control Conference, 1925, Vol. I, pp. 85-94.

[2] Raymond Pearl, "The Biology of Population Growth," p. 212. Most economists would agree with J. A. Hobson of England that "there is a close and genuine harmony between birth-control, industrial progress and a rising standard of life." "The Conditions of Industrial Peace," p. 92.

seem almost unbelievably obsolete and repressive. The federal statute forbids mailing any information as to "how or by what means conception may be prevented."[1] In the states "we find the laws in a hodge-podge, enacted without any general or well-defined principle underlying them."[2]

Mary Ware Dennett in her "Birth Control Laws"[3] points out that our obsolete legislation

[1] Penal Laws, U. S. A., Sec. 211. "Every . . . publication . . . intended for preventing conception . . . and every article . . . or thing . . . for preventing conception . . . and every written or printed . . . notice of any kind giving information . . . by what means conception may be prevented . . . shall not be conveyed in the mails." For such use of the mails the person "shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

[2] G. E. Worthington, American Social Hygiene Association. "Statutory Restrictions on Birth Control," "Journal Social Hygiene." For instance, Massachusetts, Missouri, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Colorado and Wyoming prohibit: 1. The giving or sale of any instrument, drug or medicine for preventing conception; 2, the giving of information orally where such articles may be obtained; 3, the depositions of any such things in a post office. The State of New York has an act relating to the mails as sweeping as the federal act but excepts "an article or instrument, used or applied by physicians lawfully practising, or by their direction or prescription, for the cure or prevention of disease." In the United States there are forty-eight codes of marriage, and forty-eight jurisdictions administering these codes.

[3] "Birth Control Laws: Shall We Keep Them, Change Them or Abolish Them?" by Mary Ware Dennett, The Grafton Press. Birth control is defined as "the conscious, responsible control of conception. It does not mean interference with life after conception takes place, but consists solely in the use of intelligence and scientific hygienic knowledge to determine the wise times for conception to occur, and to limit the possibility of conception to those times," p. 12.

is unenforced and unenforceable. Under our federal law it is a crime for a mother to inform her married daughter by mail how in her ill health she could postpone having her next child. For this she could be fined $5,000 and sent to jail for five years. A poor woman whose health or even life may be in danger if she bears another child too soon can be offered no relief, except sexual abstinence, in Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Mississippi, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, Wyoming, Washington and Arizona. In several states withholding of the husband's "rights" may be cause for divorce, so that a legally allowed method of contraception is itself illegal! No doctor can adequately study the control of conception, since the mails may not carry medical books nor medical journals discussing technique or supplies. Access to this information, which is freely supplied in all other enlightened countries except France, Italy and Japan, is classed as obscenity in our own Federal Laws and the laws of eleven states.

It was Anthony Comstock who in 1873 tied

this millstone about the neck of the American people in the now notorious Section 211 which has been copied by many of the states. Twenty-four states have specific prohibitions which forbid publishing, advertising or giving information concerning contraception. Fourteen states forbid any one to tell or orally impart this often deeply needed information.[1] While 23 states specifically prohibit contraceptive information, 22 others have obscenity laws modeled after the federal statute and have, therefore, the strongest legal precedent for prosecuting the circulation of such information.[2]

The original Comstock bill on February 20, 1873, was slipped through the Senate. By unanimous consent "the business of the morning hour was extended for ten minutes to permit

---

[1] "Birth Control Laws: Shall We Keep Them, Change Them or Abolish Them?" pp. 13-18. Connecticut makes it a crime either to find out about or to control conception. Apart from the criminal and ignorant, how many mothers have fulfilled the law or should have done so? And how long is such medieval and pernicious legislation to remain on our statute books unchallenged?

[2] Thus in Illinois, the Chicago Parenthood Clinic was "prohibited for mothers where conditions made the bearing of children dangerous or prejudicial to the health and welfare of the wife or child . . . and to avoid burdening the community with defective children, and the ruination of the health of countless mothers." What mattered the ruination of the health of countless mothers if only these senseless laws were kept?

discussion of the bill." The next day without further discussion the bill was blindly passed. The House then hastily passed the bill without a roll call.[1] It prohibited what they had no intention of prohibiting, "the spread of scientific education of the wise spacing of births of the human family."

These obsolete laws burden our federal and state statute books. In fifty years indictments have been few. In fact, the Government itself breaks the law.[2] Forbidden books are found in the Congressional Library. Senators and Congressmen seem willing to break the law but not to revise it. The relatively low birth rate in the more intelligent and well-to-do families indicates a wholesale breaking of these obsolete laws. Only to the millions of poor and over-burdened working women who need it most, do we deny all necessary information. Is it not time to de-

---

[1] "Birth Control Laws," p. 22. When this bill was carelessly passed the control of conception was never once mentioned by any member on the floor of either House. There is evidence that they thought they were passing in good faith a bill against obscenity without realizing the significance of the two words slipped in throughout the bill, "contraceptive information."

[2] "Birth Control Laws," pp. 46-59.

mand that Congress change this hypocritical and repressive legislation?[1]

In summarizing the evils of our present order in the relations between men and women, we quote from Miles Malleson's recent play in London in which a young man makes the following indictment of the older generation and of the present order of society:

"We couldn't very well make a worse mess than they have, could we? Well—to start with . . . the obvious things. Hundreds of thousands of girls on the streets; and an incredible amount of sex disease. One in every five infected! A million or so girls more than men doomed to a life without love. Some millions of separated people living without love and not allowed to marry again. Thousands of marriages where

[1] After nine federal indictments and the arrest of Margaret Sanger for her heroic work on behalf of working mothers, some of the leading writers and public men of England wrote to the President: "We understand that Mrs. Margaret Sanger is in danger of criminal prosecution for circulating a pamphlet on birth problems. We therefore beg to draw your attention to the fact that such work as that of Mrs. Sanger receives appreciation and circulation in every civilized country except the United States of America, where it is still counted a criminal offense." "Birth Control Laws," p. 70. Were it not for this decision obtained by Mrs. Sanger, no New York doctor could legally protect his married patient from conception when pregnancy would entail very grave hazards to life or health.

only distaste, and hate, remain. Ugliness, and cruelty, and intolerance about the whole subject that makes the sum of unnecessary suffering almost incredible. Does all that sound like a success? After all, we're responsible to the next generation for the sort of world they'll find. Have we any right to say, 'Oh, that's all right; we can't do better than that. We needn't bother'? Look at all the girls in the world—one lot selling themselves to any man who can pay them; the rest brought up in a sort of prison of asceticism, as candidates for the privilege of becoming a man's married housekeeper. The whole thing's breaking up. The Church is losing its influence. It regards sex as sin. The Church says, 'Society must be purified. Men and women must be taught not to sin.' But what they mean by purifying society is simply forcing it back under the old rules; what they mean by sin is any infringement of those rules. What we say is: it's the very narrowness of their rules that has made the mess. You *can't* do away with these things by the old rules. The old rules are the *cause* of them. Practice proves it: the countries with

easier divorce laws don't have more promiscuity; less. You *must* tackle the business with new ideas—anyhow, it's happening. It comes down to a question of personal responsibility. When outside rules go, inside rules have got to take their places. There's got to be a religious spirit; that's essential; the spirit that makes you strive to do the best with your life. Some young people to-day want to live according to their beliefs with a sincerity that's religious."

To the sister's response, "Then why doesn't somebody do something!" the young man replies, "Religion doesn't do anything because it thinks Birth Control wicked. Big Business doesn't do anything, because it wants cheap Labour; the Governments don't do anything because they want soldiers for the next war. When nations are armed to the teeth, the arms go off, sooner or later. It always has been so."

To his father the son makes the following indictment of the older generation: "*You,* who sat at home here in comfort all those five years of hell. You've forgotten. I'll tell you. Your generation has done ours in! Smashed it! Mil-

lions! If we were to stand at that window and they marched past us, they'd march all day, and all night, and all day again—for days and nights. Dead men. Dead. For what? They died to end war; to make a better world; and before their corpses have rotted into earth, new wars are preparing. And you? Is there one word of apology in you? One word of humility? No. The same old pride; and blindness; and intolerance. Because I don't want to live as you've lived, I'm lazy; because Gwen wants to live not exactly as her mother and grandmother lived, she's mad or wanton! Good God in Heaven! if there's one way that's been proved wrong it's your way! If we live exactly as you lived, it'll all happen over again!"[1]

In the light of this terrific indictment and of the serious nature of these problems of sex, what can the individual do? What reforms are needed or possible? If we accept the test that that is

---

[1] Miles Malleson's "The Fanatics," pp. 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 100, 101, 120, 121. The above quotations are not continuous. We do not hold ourselves responsible for some other parts of the above play, nor for all the ideas mentioned in the books of the list recommended for reading above.

right which enhances life as a whole and that is wrong which injures it, can we to begin with, aim to maintain no relationships with our fellows, men or women, which debase the supreme value of personality? Recognizing the potentially high function of sex, can we utilize its inspiration, its sublimation and its dynamic drive for the enrichment of the whole of life? Can we oppose the present taboo of silence and advocate sane sex education in the home, in the school and in the college, given as a normal and natural part of life as a whole?

Can we take our stand both against a pharisaic, ascetic puritanism of unnatural repression, and against a pagan promiscuity of sensual and selfish sex-gratification as an end in itself?

Can we advocate the repeal of obsolete legislation and the sane knowledge of birth limitation so freely circulated in other enlightened countries like Holland and Great Britain?

We have now completed this necessarily superficial review of some of our outstanding social problems.

However, even from this brief survey of the evils of our semi-pagan social order it is evident that sweeping changes must be wrought and evils must be eradicated. But by *whom?* Are we individually to view these evils in blind apathy, in helpless impotence, accepting them as inevitable, and ourselves drifting like dead wood on the stream of things as they are? Or are we to gird ourselves to grapple with them and, as much as in us lies, to strive to change them?

But is it not just here that we feel particularly impotent? Who are we to change this vast social order with its unjust distribution of possessions and privileges, its wealth unshared and poverty unrelieved, its deep-rooted race prejudice, its long record of war, its unsolved problems of sex and law enforcement? We ask again, is there any dynamic in religion that can meet this supreme need for the individual and for society?

In a companion volume, "Makers of Freedom," we have sought to show how individuals and small groups have led the way in the great reformations and achievements of the past. Francis and his "little brothers of the poor" led

a dynamic movement in the thirteenth century, Luther won freedom from ecclesiastical bondage in the sixteenth, and John Wesley led the great evangelical revival in the eighteenth century. William Lloyd Garrison and his fellow workers lived to see the abolition of slavery during their lifetime. Booker Washington, John J. Eagan and their friends worked for the uplift of a race. Keir Hardy, Ramsay MacDonald and their associates won freedom from a large measure of social injustice in industry. One and all these men knew not only the personal satisfaction but the social dynamic of vital religion which they experienced as an actual power in their lives. Whatever our modern concepts or theories, can we to-day experience this reality of religion as a drive and dynamic in our lives?

V. THE PROBLEM OF RELIGION

Man confronts life and the universe as a challenging problem. He sees himself and the world as a mystery. He seems to stand in the presence of reality. With Spencer he feels himself to be "everywhere in the presence of an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed." But what is the nature of that energy? Is it like matter or mind? Is the universe mere mechanism or a vital organism? Has the universe a source or ground, and has life any meaning or object or end? If so, can man relate his life to this source and to this end? To do so is to enter the sphere of religion.

It is, however, not necessary to do so. A man may live upon a vegetative or animal plane, a piecemeal, hand-to-mouth existence without thought or purpose or aim. But if he seeks to understand, to unify, to integrate, to harmonize his life and to relate it to its possible source and

end, he is now standing on the threshold of religion. Indeed it is difficult to escape it, for religion is ineradicably rooted deep in human nature. In its lower ranges, could we define religion as the effort "to bring the whole of experience into the light of the best that one knows and to organize that experience in loyalty to that best?" If a man is devoted to the spiritual values of truth, goodness, beauty and love, he has already begun to be religious. But what is the best that we know?

A certain manufacturer makes a simple eggbeater in sixteen parts. He says you can put those parts in a churn and turn them for a thousand years but you will get no eggbeater by chance. It takes intelligence even to put his simple eggbeater together. The writer went to see the Ford motor works, and the car in its some four thousand parts came off the moving table under its own power. He did not conclude from the relative perfection of the machine that there was no mind behind it, but went in to see the inventor, to try to come in touch with the mind of the man behind the machine. So, if he sees this

vast universe, not a simple eggbeater, or motor mechanism, but from each electron in its mathematical orbit, from each element in the periodic scale of its atomic weight, to the calculable motions of the heavenly bodies and the infinite sweep of the ordered universe as a whole, he can say with Darwin that "the mind refuses to look upon it as the outcome of chance—that is, without purpose or design." He is forced to seek to come to terms with this whole of Reality, this Source of Life, this infinite and eternal Energy, this Cause or Ground which includes truth, goodness and beauty, the little flower, the mind of man, and Jesus of Nazareth. This Reality must be great enough to include them all.[1]

We may conceive religion as the effort to find the source, the meaning and the object of life, and vitally to relate our lives to them. It seeks not to drift blindly, but to see life steadily and to *make* it whole. It aims to integrate, to relate,

[1] For a working definition at the outset could we define God as "the creative Force manifest as energy, life, order, beauty, thought, conscience or love, and self-revealed supremely in the creative Person of Jesus of Nazareth, and operative in all Jesus-like movements in the world to-day?" "My Idea of God," p. 18. Henry Sloane Coffin.

to harmonize life about its best. It seeks in a world of relative values to find the highest value. What is that highest value? *Can* life be integrated and related to its source? Can it find satisfaction and harmony? Can it possess the dynamic drive to achieve its desired ends? And if so, is not this a practical and imperative consideration for every seriously minded person concerned for social justice? We are not now thinking of religion in creedal or institutional terms. Many great social reformers have rejected all orthodox forms of religion but have still lived gloriously in the service of needy men. Because human values have for us so central a place in religion, we are glad to think of these men as being to that extent truly religious.

Instead of arguing in the abstract, may I at the risk of being misunderstood, turn to a simple narrative of personal experience of what religion has meant to me? As I look back over the last forty years I think I can trace certain successive steps in the discovery of new truth. Life has seemed to expand in widening circles of experience.

THE PROBLEM OF RELIGION

I.

More than forty years ago, during early adolescence, the Christian message came to me as a simple *personal* experience. With naïve trust I believed that God was a loving Father, and that life was his free gift; that Christ was a personal Savior, and that through him I could know a sense of forgiveness and enter into a glad sense of sonship. By simple trust I believed that I received this gift of forgiveness and life from God. I had entered upon a personal, possessive "salvation" of my own soul. Quite unconsciously it was a selfish experience that ignored a whole world of human need. But I thought that this was all. The whole duty of man, as then presented to me, was to glorify God, and to win other individuals to this same personal, possessive salvation for the life which now is and for that which is to come.

II.

Some thirty-five years ago there came a widening of horizons that took in "a world of sinning

and suffering men, each man my brother," a world for which I was responsible. The truth now dawned upon me as a missionary gospel, a *universal* experience, that was to be shared with all men, especially in the needier and backward nations. I was challenged with the summons from these so-called "heathen" nations to my own country as a supposedly "Christian" nation. I felt, "woe is me if I preach not the gospel"; and with ten thousand of the youth of the last generation in a crusade whose motto was "the evangelization of the world in this generation," I set my face toward foreign fields, to spend the next fifteen years in India.

But this wider gospel brought with it a searching challenge before which I was utterly insufficient; it drove me to deeper depths in the spiritual life. One day in speaking to my roommate I said, "We are going out, you to China and I to India, but what is to be our message? Are we merely going to tell them about the historic Christ? It would be cheaper to send them books and tracts which could do that." Could we say that we were "more than conquerors" in our own

personal experience? When we agreed that we could not, from that day as students we set our alarm clocks for five in the morning, and for the rest of our student days we had, each separately in his own room, daily two unhurried hours for communion with God. Those two hours a day seemed like windows opened into a new life. We now had a missionary gospel, glad tidings for the whole world. And we thought that that was all.

III.

If I may be permitted deliberately to repeat a testimony that I have felt compelled to make many times, thirty years ago, in November, 1897, religion came to me as a *satisfying* experience. I had gone out to India with high hopes and youthful enthusiasm, but within a year I was broken down with overwork, on the verge of nervous prostration. I was suffering from maladjustment; my life had been one of overwork but not of overflow; it was like dreary artificial pumping, there were no spontaneous rivers of inward experience flowing out in joyous service.

I had failed in my outward service because I was failing in my inward life.

At last I touched bottom. I was bitter, discouraged, rebellious. I still believed there was a God but that I had missed the way, and one morning after a sleepless night, I cried to God to show me the way out. And then in the dawn of a new truth, one simple word changed life forever. It was said to have been spoken to a woman by a well. Paraphrased it might read: "Whoever drinks of the waters of this earth will thirst again." They do not satisfy—wealth, pleasure, power, ambition, knowledge, the world, the flesh—"but whoever drinks, and keeps drinking of the water of life that I shall give him shall never thirst again." Oh, I thought, if I could have such an experience as that, never to thirst again! But it was not for me; it was not for any man of my temperament. For years my life had been up and down, in alternate success and failure, in victory and defeat. I had been the victim of my inward feelings and outward circumstances. I could not say that I was the master of myself, "the captain of my soul." I

said to myself, "I could never hold out, I would forget, I would lose my grip again."

But then came the thought: could I not drink to-day, could I trust to-day, live to-day? I could do almost anything for one day. For I would never have to live but just one day at a time by faith. Then let me, as John Wesley wrote in the flyleaf of his Bible: "Live to-day!"

"Greatly begin, though thou have time
But for a line;
Be that sublime.
Not failure, but low aim, is crime."

That day in November, 1897, I began to seek to draw upon God for everything, as the source of life within. When I consulted Professor Moulton of Cambridge, England, as an authority on the Greek tenses, he said: "We drink that inward well once for all, and then experimentally, we drink and keep drinking of that inward fountain of life in the continuous present."

From that day I set apart a quiet time every morning as regularly as I ate my breakfast. I had now to seek the full integration of the con-

templative and active sides of existence, of inflow and overflow, of communion with God and service for man. I sought at the beginning of each day to relate my life to its Source, to live and move and have my being in God, as the Whole of Reality. Something happened that day thirty years ago, and it has been happening ever since. I have often failed God but he has never failed me. There has never been an hour that I was satisfied with myself, my character, or my service. But thenceforth, the eternal God was my refuge and underneath were the everlasting arms. For these last thirty years there has not been, literally, an hour of darkness, or of discouragement. And I believe that I shall never thirst again.

It did not say: "Whoever drank once," at this experience, or that conference, or convention, or time; but, "Whoever, once for all drinks, and continuously keeps drinking of the fountain or source of life within, shall never thirst again." I believe that life has become immovably centered in God, that he is the central certainty, the deep inward spring of all true life, the fountain and source of an ever-enlarging life within! And yet

again, I thought that surely this was all. But I count it now a relatively small thing to have in a measure attained to emotional poise, to some mastery of feeling and of circumstance. I was again leaving out the real world of human need.

IV.

Many years ago, so gradually that I can fix no definite date, religion began to dawn upon me as a *rational* experience. It was not some ancient or medieval obscurantist message, received upon external authority and held in a watertight compartment of my being, apart from the rest of life. It was rather a spirit that must infuse the whole of life. And nothing human could now be foreign to me. Limited and ignorant though I was, and everywhere under the aegis of relativity, I was yet a candidate for truth, and all reality was my portion. I must come to terms with modern science. I must cast off the grave-clothes of the dead past. I must rigorously purge from my belief all elements of superstition and of irrationality with which my message had been mixed; and there were many such. Every year of my

life there was some fresh aspect of truth to challenge, to disturb me, to force me to come to terms with it; even though it displaced some things that I had counted true in the past. But this was the inevitable sign of all life, which is not static but dynamic.

V.

With the war religion began to dawn upon me as a *social* experience. In 1914 the volcanic upheaval broke upon us. I saw it along the terrible front, from Ypres to Verdun. I saw a few of the ten millions who were killed. But I seemed to see war as only a symptom of the striving world beneath. I saw the world rent and divided in industrial, racial and international strife—a world of sordid materialism, autocratic exploitation and organized militarism, ever preparing for further war. Had I a philosophy of life or a message equal to this whole world's need? My personal gospel proved inadequate. We were not saving a fraction of these men, struggling, hating, dying. Eighty per cent of them, even in England and America, were out of contact with

the churches and with all organized religion. Indeed it was the "Christian" countries that were armed to the teeth as world powers, that had fought the bulk of the wars during the last few centuries and whose imperialism had conquered nine-tenths of the planet. The church was obediently blessing the war, taking sides in it, praying to the God of battles for victory over their fellow Christians.

Had I a gospel big enough to meet the needs of this warring world and this unjust social order? In seeking a solution I turned back to study Jesus' way of life, in the simple love of God and one's neighbor, recognizing the infinite worth of every human person, the brotherhood of all, united in one great law of love and consummated in a new social order. Here was the best that I knew. Here was a worthy ideal, if there was an adequate dynamic, individually to live and socially to achieve it.

Now there broke upon me the first gleams of a social gospel that sought not only to save individuals for the future, but here and now in this world of bitter need, to christianize the whole of

life and all its relationships—industrial, social, sexual, racial, international. Religion was not primarily something to be believed, or felt; it was something to be done, a life to be lived, a principle and a program to be incarnated in character and built into a social order. This social gospel added a new dimension to life, it raised it to a higher power. At last the scales fell from my eyes and I saw this new facet of truth, and as clearly as once I had felt a call to proclaim a message to less favored nations, now I felt again, "Woe is me if I preach not this social gospel." As I had once seen Christ identified with the need of distant pagan lands, I saw him now, hungry and athirst, naked, sick and in prison, in the pagan practices and the blighted lives of our own social order.

But I saw that there would be much more opposition from professing Christians if I preached a gospel of social justice, than ever there had been from so-called "heathen" nations in calling them to turn from their idols. Indeed, Mammon is a much more potent idol, it is more cruel, smeared with more human blood, than Kali of

Siva. They sacrifice goats to Kali and we shudder; we sacrifice men to Mammon and justify our "rights." In simple fact, though they are not worthy of mention, I have met with more opposition and misrepresentation, ten times over, in "Christian" America, than I ever met in fifteen years in India, or in repeated visits to China, Turkey or Russia.

What then are the demands and implications of this social message and experience?

It stands for social justice in industry and the whole economic sphere. It demands that society shall not be divided between an exploiting and an exploited class; the one monopolizing and the other seeking the means of livelihood, but that we shall ask no rest, nor accept any, until we approach some distant measure of equality of opportunity that shall provide "the good life" for all who toil.

It demands social justice in race relations, for white or black, yellow or brown. It demands that social justice in arbitration and judicial procedure shall take the place of the savage arbitra-

ment of war, and the constant clamor for maximum preparation for it.

It demands social justice in the enforcement of our constitution and our dry laws for rich and poor alike; not only for working men who make better profits for us if they are kept sober, but also for congressmen and politicians, for the rich and their sons in college.

It demands social justice for men and women, for age and youth in their sex life and relations, that shall repudiate a pharisaic, ascetic puritanism of unnatural repression on the one hand, and the pagan promiscuity of sensual gratification on the other. It demands the repeal of obsolete legislation that denies to multitudes of working women who need it most, the same knowledge of family limitation which men and women of more wealth and education continually possess and practice.

Here then is the challenge of vital religion for social justice with which we began and with which we close:

Believing in Jesus' way of life and in his all-inclusive principle of love as the full sharing of

life, I therefore determine to apply this principle in all the relationships of life:

1. *To live simply* and sacrificially, avoiding waste and luxury. To make the purpose of my life the making of men rather than the making of money. Not to grow rich in a poor world by laying up treasures for myself but to share all with my fellow men. To apply the golden rule in all my relationships.

2. *To practice brotherhood toward all.* To remember that every human being is a person of infinite worth, deserving the fullest opportunity for self-development. To participate in no secret order or fraternity if it tends to exclusiveness, prejudice or strife. To seek justice for every man without distinction of caste or color.

3. *To make peace* where there is strife; to seek to outlaw war, "the world's chief collective sin," as piracy and slavery have already been outlawed, substituting a positive program of international justice and good-will.

4. *To redeem the social order;* to test its evils by the principle of love and fearlessly to challenge them as Jesus challenged the money-

changers in the temple. To endeavor to replace them by the constructive building of the new social order, the Kingdom of God on earth. If a student, to apply this purpose immediately to the problems of the campus; to seek education as training for service rather than the mere enjoyment of privilege, the attainment of grades or the achievement of cheap "success"; to tolerate no dishonest practices in classroom, athletics or college elections; to maintain no relationships with my fellows, men or women, which debase the supreme value of personality.

Since I realize my inability to achieve this way of life unaided:

5. *To seek a new discovery of God* which will release within my life new springs of power such as men in the past have experienced when they rediscovered the religion of Jesus.

William Carey Int'l University
3 1539 0071220